# THE PREFACE.

HAVING been called upon by authority for a Diſcourſe on a public occaſion, I wiſhed to ſelect ſuch a ſubject as might tend to ſome general benefit in the Chriſtian world; and having afterwards ſubmitted to the opinion of others, that it might prove more uſeful in the preſent age, by means of a more extenſive circulation, I could not but foreſee at the ſame time, that it might be hereby expoſed to ſome animadverſions, by its not falling in with the rage of the times for innovation, both in Religion and Government *. Accordingly Dr. Prieſtley has lately publiſhed ſome remarks upon this Diſcourſe, in an Appendix to his *Sermon on the Importance of free Inquiry in Matters of Religion*; and if there be any parts of my Diſcourſe, which ſhall not be able to ſuſtain the ſcrutiny of ſuch a free enquiry, I ſhall myſelf be the firſt to expunge, alter or amend, whatever ſhall appear not well founded either in evidence or argument: it is only by thus impartially correcting all miſtakes, that new opinions can ſtand the teſt of time; and if there had not been ſomething new in this, I could not have acceded to its publication; nothing being leſs acceptable to the world than to be tired with the repetition of old errors, unleſs it be the too haſty production of new ones; which, however, by my thus

* By innovation, I mean ſtrictly mere novelties, ſuch as include no real improvements and reformation upon the whole, after balancing advantages and diſadvantages.

thinking aloud I ſhall now have an opportunity to diſcover and correct. But, after having giving due attention to Dr. Prieſtley's remarks, I have not hitherto diſcovered any exceptionable parts in my Diſcourſe, which ſeem abſolutely to require either alteration or rejection; and in order that I may the better examine the inſolidity of his remarks, as well as arrange my own in ſome connected order, I ſhall conſider them under the ſeveral diſtinct heads of miſquotation and miſconſtruction, inconcluſive reaſoning, inconſiſtency, inattention, and both hiſtoric and critical error.

In regard to the articles of *miſquotation* and *miſconſtruction* of my words, Dr. Prieſtley quotes the following paſſage from my Diſcourſe, (p. 6.) and ſays, that I repreſent him as *one* of thoſe who, "having been beaten out of all their pretences for abſolute unbelief concerning the origin, nature and utility of the Chriſtian revelation, ſeem now to adopt a kind of compromiſe with Chriſtianity; for they now *affect* to ſtyle themſelves *rational Chriſtians*, and philoſophers; that is, they *pretend* to retain ſome parts of the Chriſtian revelation, ſuch as they judge moſt proper, but to reject other parts of it."

Thus Dr. P. quotes this paſſage, at his p. 88; but if he had quoted it accurately, it could not have been liable to the miſconſtruction which he puts upon it, as if I repreſented him to be *one* of the unbelievers there referred to; for then I muſt have repreſented him as living at the *beginning*, not at the *end* of the preſent century: and it is only by omiſſions and mutilations, and by joining incoherent parts together, that he has made me ſeem to ſay what the

the paſſage does not really expreſs. For inſtance, he has altogether *omitted* the following words, at the *beginning*, the *middle*, and the *end* of that period. " To enumerate the different and oppoſite conduct of the adverſaries of Chriſtianity in different ages would require too much time; it is ſufficient to obſerve in general, that having *in the beginning* of the preſent century been beaten out of abſolute unbelief, &c. —they now ſeem deſirous *at the cloſe of this memorable century, &c.*—and thus they would form ſome *new* and peculiar *Chriſtian ſyſtem* of their own." What can be plainer, than that if theſe words had not been all *omitted*, they would have confined what I ſay concerning the *adverſaries* of Chriſtianity to the *beginning* of this century? to whom are oppoſed the *compromiſers* with Chriſtianity *at the cloſe* of the century, and the latter I immediately after allow to have formed a *new ſect*, and this expreſsly a *Chriſtian* one. Moreover, the words, *they ſeem now deſirous*, were not intended to refer to the *adverſaries* of Chriſtianity, but to the *men of perverſe diſputings*, with the mention of whom the *preceding* period cloſes, who have been partly *unbelievers*, and partly *compromiſing believers*; neither could the pronoun *they* be made to refer to any other *perſons*, without involving the whole period in contradiction, if the above-mentioned parts of it had not been intirely omitted. However, if it be thought of uſe to preciſion, I have no objection to a repetition of the words, " men of perverſe diſputings," and thus inſtead of " they ſeem now deſirous," to ſay, " ſucceeding diſputers ſeem now deſirous, &c." That this muſt have been my meaning, is proved again at the bot-

tom of the very next page, where I expreſsly include Dr. Prieſtley, by name, among the *Chriſtian* ſects of Arians and Sabellians. I am glad, however, to find him ſo deſirous to be thus included among Chriſtians, and certainly in the above-mentioned period he has been excommunicated only by his own *omiſſions*.—Nevertheleſs, Dr. P. goes on to accuſe the ſame paſſage above-mentioned of containing "an inſinuation that he *only pretends* to believe Chriſtianity." But how can this be true, when I have immediately added, "that theſe writers would form ſome *new Chriſtian* ſyſtem of their own?" Yet even without this clauſe the mere word *pretend* of itſelf contains no ſuch bad ſenſe, as he erroneouſly aſcribes to it: for its meaning, in proper language, is only *to profeſs*; ſo that my words, in reality, expreſs nothing more, than that philoſophic Chriſtians "*pretend* or *profeſs an ability* (conſiſtently with ſcripture and hiſtory) to retain ſome parts of Chriſtianity, but to reject other parts of it.*" The *pretence* then here objected to by me conſiſts in this, "that the philoſophic Chriſtians make public *profeſſion* of believing Chriſtianity in ſome peculiar mode of their own," and *not* in their *only* making ſuch a profeſſion without really believing as they profeſs: for a *pretence* and *profeſſion* may be a *true* one as well as a *falſe* one; which latter ſenſe *to pretend* never does acquire, until ſome ſuch word

* "*To pretend*, is to uſe a pretence, whether truly or falſely; to preſume on ability to do any thing, to profeſs preſumptuouſly." *Bailey's Diction. Scot's Edit.*

as *only* or *merely* is joined with it, to ſhew that the pretence is a *falſe* one. Agreeably to this, Dr. P. himſelf is forced to introduce the word *only* (which is not in my Diſcourſe) before he can make even his own words expreſs the inſinuation, which he erroneouſly imputes to me. That my words neither really do, nor were intended to convey any ſuch inſinuation, is moreover confirmed by the ſubjoined parallel paſſages, where my word *pretend* cannot poſſibly mean a *falſe pretence*, without intirely deſtroying the ſenſe: * for in theſe parallel examples I could never mean to aſſert, that the Gnoſtics in the firſt caſe, and the Unitarians in the ſecond, *only* pretended, and did not *really*, the one think, and the other act, as they have there pretended and profeſſed. Similar attention to the propriety of language will equally remove Dr. P.'s miſconſtruction of my word *affect*; which by his putting into italics, he ſeems to have marked as being of evil tendency: for the *affectation* there expreſſed does not conſiſt in their affecting to be *Chriſtians*, much leſs in *only* affecting it; but in their affecting to be *rational* Chriſtians, or more rational than other Chriſtians. *Affect* alſo, like *pretend*, inſinuates no bad ſenſe, until *only* be joined with it, but quite the contrary †.

* "The Gnoſtics pretended, that the orthodox Chriſtian doctrine was not ſufficiently ſublime," *p.* 12. "The Unitarians pretend to appeal, not merely to the words of Scripture, but alſo to the belief of that antient ſect of Gnoſtics and other ſectaries of the firſt ages," *p.* 13.

† "Muſing Meditation moſt *affects*
The penſive ſecrecy of deſert cell." *Milton's Comus.*

The

The *inconcluſive reaſoning* in Dr. P:'s remarks, appears ſufficiently in the unwarranted concluſion, which he draws from the following paſſage in my Diſcourſe: to his quotation of which I have no material objection; for his alteration of my words *theſe ſects* into *the ſects* does no otherwiſe affect the ſubject, except that my own phraſe reſtrained my aſſertion more particularly to the Ebionites and Nazarenes than to the Gnoſtics. Dr. Prieſtley then ſays rightly, that I have aſſerted, at p. 15, " that all *the ſects* differed from the orthodox *chiefly*, with reſpect to the *time* when the union of Divinity and humanity took place, not with reſpect to the *fact* itſelf," (that is, ſo far as relates to the ſubject there under conſideration, namely, the different opinions of thoſe ſects concerning *the nature of Chriſt*.) On this he obſerves, " But is it at all credible, that ſo ſmall a difference as that of admitting the divinity of Chriſt to have taken place a few years ſooner or later, could poſſibly have cauſed all that animoſity, which the orthodox expreſſed towards the Gnoſtics and antient Unitarians? Such aſſertions as theſe deſerve no ſerious *reply*." p. 87. But ſuch aſſertions as theſe founded on *evidence*, there produced from an antient authority, and which will be confirmed by more, demand a ſerious refutation; and they cannot be properly *replied* to otherwiſe, than by refuting that *evidence* produced, let the *concluſion* which may be drawn from them be what it will: for we are not to ſet aſide a *fact* proved by poſitive evidence, becauſe a *concluſion* may follow from it, which we cannot account for at this diſtance of time from the ſcene of action.—However, the real truth

is,

is, that no ſuch *concluſion* does actually follow, as that this *ſmall difference* was the cauſe of *all that* animoſity toward the ſectaries; neither have I any where affirmed or hinted any ſuch thing; it is intirely a concluſion of Dr. Prieſtley's own, and by no means a true concluſion. For altho' there was only this *ſmall* difference (in caſe it was really a ſmall one) between the orthodox and firſt ſectaries, with reſpect to their ſeveral opinions concerning the appearance and nature of *the Chriſt*; yet there were *other* differences upon other ſubjects, which of themſelves alone could not fail to produce animoſity; ſuch as the attachment of the Ebionites and Nazarenes to the Jewiſh law; and the tenet of the Gnoſtics, that the ſupreme Deity was neither the Creator of the world, nor the God of the Jews, with many others: and accordingly Dr. Prieſtley himſelf repeatedly contends in his other tracts, that theſe *other* differences were the true cauſes of *all that* animoſity between the orthodox and the above-mentioned ſectaries. Why then does he here ſuppoſe the directly contrary? I certainly have not ſuppoſed it, nor even hinted at ſuch a ſuppoſition: nay quite the contrary; for it was in my view to prove, after eſtabliſhing the fact itſelf concerning the *ſmall difference* between the orthodox and ſectaries relative to the Chriſt, that this *might be* the very cauſe, why there was ſo *little animoſity* (as Dr. P. contends there was) between the orthodox and ſectaries, on the ground of their belief in Chriſt; namely, becauſe they were *all* believers in the Divinity of the Chriſt in ſome mode or other; their differences in this reſpect being *chiefly* in regard to the

the *time* of his union with the humanity of Jeſus, or elſe in regard to the *degree* of the Chriſt's Divinity. So that they were nearly in the ſame caſe with ourſelves; for, although the epiſcopals nearly agree with moſt of our ſectaries in regard to their tenets concerning Chriſt, yet they have had animoſities about ceremonies and *other* opinions, extraneous to their common Chriſtian belief. My aſſertion, then, there ſupported by evidence cannot be the leſs true, becauſe Dr. Prieſtley reaſons inconcluſively from that aſſertion; and at the ſame time in direct contradiction not only to the concluſion, which naturally flows from it, but alſo to his own words in his other tracts.

For the remark of Dr. Prieſtley above-mentioned, contains moreover (I ſay) an *inconſiſtency* with his words elſewhere; ſince here he admits as a true fact, "that the orthodox did expreſs *conſiderable* animoſity, not only againſt the Gnoſtics, but alſo againſt the *antient Unitarians*," i. e. the Ebionites and Nazarenes: Nevertheleſs, it has been his uniform object in his other tracts to prove the directly contrary; and that the antient Unitarians were not conſidered as heretics, nor expelled from communion, but treated with the greateſt lenity *. How to account for this inconſiſtency is above my comprehenſion: for it cannot be ſuppoſed that one who profeſſes to be a candid enquirer after truth, will magnify at one time that animoſity of the orthodox againſt

* "Irenæus, Tertullian and Origen did not treat the Unitarians as heretics, *p.* 48.——The Unitarians lived in communion with the catholic church in the early ages, *p.* 60. *Lett. to Dr. H. part.* 2.

the

the Unitarians, which on every other occaſion he ſeeks to diminiſh. I rather ſuppoſe, that this inconſiſtency aroſe from the great force of truth itſelf; which will every now and then riſe uppermoſt in the mind, however it may be ſuppreſſed for a time by ſyſtems of innovation and error. Now the real truth is, that there is very ſufficient evidence exſtant, although Dr. P. has overlooked it, that Irenæus, Tertullian and Origen do every one of them expreſsly call the antient Unitarians heretics; conſequently they could neither be admitted into communion, nor treated without ſome animoſity.

As to Dr. Prieſtley's doubt, why I inſerted Mr. Gibbon's name in my title page, I can only refer this to his *inattention* * ; and indeed I really thought, that it could not have been unknown to any one. For my profeſſed object was to call back men of learning, ability and merit of *every denomination*, into that ſtraight and narrow path which leads to Truth, inſtead of ſuffering themſelves to wander for ever in the devious and thorny wilderneſs of diſputation and error: neither indeed would Truth be far from them all, if they would but ſubmit to its embraces; for it is with Truth as with common Happineſs, *eſt Ulubris, animus ſi vos non deficit æquus.* It is of no importance then whether Dr. P. be a believer, and Mr. Gibbon (as Dr. P. ſays) a

* "What the author meant, by claſſing me with Mr. Gibbon, is beſt known to himſelf—however, though equal mention is made of Mr. Gibbon and myſelf in the title page, there is no mention made of Mr. Gibbon in the body of the diſcourſe." *p.* 89.

known unbeliever; for however they may differ in all such respects, yet they may agree in this, that they have both of them sought for truth in the mode of hasty disputation instead of cautious and candid investigation: it is for this reason then that their names are placed together in the title page, as being both of them recent and conspicuous examples how often genius leads men astray from truth, in case they once give up the reins to a talent for disputation. And if I have not produced particular examples concerning one writer as well as the other, it was only from want of breath and time; that precious time so often spent in forming imaginary systems, which the next age pulls to pieces again, as soon as men are returned to their sober senses; and which all the talent of disputation cannot support, nor prolong beyond their destined periods.—Another instance of *inattention* occurs, where Dr. P. thinks, "that I have expressed some insinuations concerning himself in a great variety of phrases towards the close of my Discourse." To what particular words he alludes I am ignorant; but the fact is, that my *whole* last paragraph contains, throughout, an address to my own audience, as is proved by those words, *we*, *our*, *ourselves*, which so often occur there; and it contains the very same advice in effect, which Dr. P. has since given in his own sermon, viz. "that it is very little advantage which any superiority of ability can give to the cause of error, and it cannot be of long continuance;" I do not, however, arrive at the the same conclusion with our *mistaken christian* Dr. Priestley, that "if what he calls *free enquiry*

(and

(and I call *unſolid diſputation*) ſhould end in the deſtruction of Chriſtianity itſelf, it ought not on that account to be diſcontinued:" (*p.* 18 *and* 23.) for diſputation never yet did nor ever will lead to the diſcovery of truth, but rather to involve it in ſtill greater perplexity than before. I can then neither diſcover what Dr. P. diſapproves in that paragraph, nor how he himſelf is any more concerned in what is ſaid there in general than Dr. Horſeley is, or than Waterland and Clark. That Dr. Prieſtley's mode of free enquiry (as he calls it) has not led him to the truth concerning the tenets of the Ebionites and many other facts in Chriſtian antiquity I do indeed affirm; and that it has been owing to this very circumſtance of a too haſty talent at diſputation: but this has equally miſled Dr. Horſeley in regard to the Nazarenes, whoſe opinion is the ſame with that of Waterland, Berriman, Mangey, and other orthodox writers; a proof that the circumſtance of orthodoxy has given no bias to my own judgment; but that by not being engaged in the warmth of diſputation I have been able to ſee, what none of thoſe parties could ſee, that they have all in their ſeveral turns been miſled by that very method of argumentation, which ſo often puts on the ſpecious appearance without the reality of free inquiry. In all the foregoing remarks then by Dr. P. upon my Diſcourſe he has been combating, what? not my words and my thoughts, but ſuch expreſſions, ſenſes and inſinuations as are not really contained in my words, ſo far I can judge of their force, but at leaſt were certainly never in my intention; nor could they

have even acquired any appearance of containing what he imputes to me, except by the aid of imperfect quotations, additions and omiſſions.

We come now to Dr. P's laſt remarks, which I have to accuſe of *hiſtoric and critical error*; yet theſe are in truth the only ones, which do really affect any thing advanced in my Diſcourſe; they are however confined to the following very narrow compaſs: "The author has given us a ſpecimen of his evidence (in favor of his curious aſſertion, that the Ebionites held the divinity of Chriſt) in ſome extracts from Epiphanius, who moſt ridiculouſly aſcribes the opinions of the Gnoſtics to ſome of the *later* Ebionites, and who alſo repreſents them as worſhipping water as a God. The author alſo attributes the extracts from Theodotus in Clemens Alexandrinus to Theodotus the Tanner. I need not tell any ſcholar how contrary this notion is to all probability, or how deſtitute it is of the leaſt ſhadow of evidence in antiquity. Sylburgius and Potter, the truely learned editors of Clemens, were far from being of his opinion," *p.* 87.

Now theſe remarks are concerning ſubjects which will come in courſe to be conſidered in their proper places, and which I cannot therefore enter upon at preſent ſufficiently at length to do them juſtice: I ſhall then only briefly obſerve, that they contain nothing of the leaſt weight againſt what has been advanced in my Diſcourſe. For it is not true that Epiphanius is ſpeaking only of ſome of the *later* Ebionites, but actually of the *oldeſt* claſs of them: neither is he the only antient author, who attributes ſuch tenets to them, for Tertul-

lian

lian a more original, more antient, and moſt unexceptionable author does the ſame, "Poterit hæc opinio Hebioni convenire, qui nudum hominem et tantum ex ſemine David, id eſt non et Dei filium, conſtituit Jeſum; prophetis plane aliquo glorioſiorem, ut ita in illo *Angelus* fuiſſe dicatur, quemadmodum in aliquo Zacharia: niſi quod a Chriſto numquam eſt dictum, "Et ait mihi Angelus," qui *in me* loquebatur." *De Carne Chriſti.* See Zechariah, ch. 2. and afterwards. This brief paſſage contains proof of Hebion's holding both the *pre-exiſtence* and ſubordinate *divinity* of the Chriſt; and theſe tenets are here expreſsly attributed to Hebion himſelf, that is, to the original author of that-ſect, whatever his name was, conſequently to the *firſt* claſs of Ebionites. It is obſervable, moreover, with what propriety Tertullian diſtinguiſhes *Jeſus* from *Chriſtus* according as he ſpeaks of him before or after his union with the divine Angel.—In regard to Theodotus, this will be diſcuſſed afterwards, at preſent I ſhall only obſerve, that if modern authority were capable to decide the queſtion I can produce as good authority on my ſide, that of Cave and M. Simon: but I form my judgment from internal evidence in thoſe extracts themſelves. It is wonderful however, that Dr. P. ſhould again truſt to modern authorities, which have ſo often deceived him before; and it is abſolutely inconſiſtent in the ſame writer to appeal to modern authority at all, concerning a ſubject, which may be judged of by its own internal evidence ſtill extant; when at the ſame time he rejects all authority whatever concerning facts in the infancy of Chriſtianity, in regard

to

to which we have little evidence preſerved, except authority, to prove them, but no evidence at all againſt them. This inconſiſtency is doubled, when Dr. P. appeals to thoſe very authorities of Epiphanius and others for any facts in his own favor; and yet without heſitation rejects the authority of the very ſame authors, and even of the ſame words when they make againſt him. I know nothing, which this conduct reſembles ſo much, as the caſe of thoſe idolaters, who when they have been diſappointed by their idols of the objects of their petitions, take them down from their pedeſtals and whip them into better behavior for the future: If the Fathers will not ſpeak as the Unitarians would wiſh, is it not religious perſecution thus to employ torture? As to my being miſtaken (he ſays) in claſſing the Gnoſtics with the Ebionites, we ſee already that the error is in him and not in me; and the ſame in regard to another part of the ſame ſubject; for there is another general error, which runs through his *hiſtory* and tracts in defence of it, in his always conſidering the Gnoſtics as being *all* Phantomiſts, although in reality it was only *one* claſs of them who were ſo; the other three out of the four chief claſſes of Gnoſtics, and theſe the moſt numerous ones, held the union of the divine Chriſt to the *real humanity* of Jeſus, like the Ebionites: therefore if the Ebionites were Unitarians, thoſe three claſſes of Gnoſtics were Unitarians likewiſe, or rather no ſuch principles as thoſe of the modern Unitarians were then known or heard of in the chriſtian world.

Unitarianiſm is, indeed, a mere modern invention, and without any other ſupport than

ſuch

ſuch abuſes in the talent of diſputation: but wherever any abuſe of it is attributed by me to Dr. Prieſtley in particular, his name is expreſly mentioned, as at p. 8; and throughout my whole Diſcourſe, as well as in the title page, the errors of the *miſtaken Chriſtian* on the one hand, and the ſins of *miſtaken philoſophy* on the other, are both of them charitably covered under the veil of a want of due *conviction* in the underſtanding, together with an exceſs of warmth in literary zeal or religious prejudices *.

* Dr. P. ſuggeſts "that a *miſtaken chriſtian* is a character more obnoxious to a high churchman than a *known unbeliever p.* 89.

# REMARKS,

*In vindication of Epiphanius, Euſebius, Hegeſippus, Origen, Jerom, and other antient Chriſtian Fathers from the miſtakes or miſrepreſentations of modern metaphyſical Reformers of Chriſtianity; ſhewing more particularly, that eccleſiaſtic hiſtory ſupplies no evidence of there having ever exiſted ſo much as a ſingle heretical ſect of Chriſtians, who maintained, that Jeſus was a mere man during his miniſtry, and not united with divinity either at his birth or baptiſm, at leaſt not before Paulus of Samoſata, 260 years after Chriſt, or Artemon at the earlieſt, about 40 years ſooner; conſequently, that the tenets of no one heretical ſect of the firſt and ſecond century can be adduced in proof, that the mere humanity of Jeſus had been the original Chriſtian doctrine (as modern reformers pretend) until it was corrupted and expelled from Chriſtian Congregations by philoſophical converts from Platoniſm about the time of Juſtin Martyr in the 140th year; who (as they maintain) firſt introduced the Divinity of Jeſus: but on the contrary, from the late appearance of the tenet of Chriſt's mere humanity during his miſſion, viz. about the middle of the third century, it becomes plain, that when it was*

*introduced, it was an innovation made by ſpeculative men, who attempted to reform Chriſtianity agreeably to their own metaphyſical notions, which they dignified with the title of Philoſophy; as was long ago pointed out by Tertullian, Caius and Euſebius; a revival of which plan has been attempted by a ſimilar claſs of men in modern times, who ſtyle themſelves Unitarians.*

Veritati cœcit as Haereticorum nulla preſcribet, nec quoniam in Chriſto aliquid tenent, aliquid non tenent, alterum vident, alterum non vident, eripietur nobis illud quod non vident per illud quod vident.

*Novatianus de Trinitate.*

AS Mr. Bryant not long ſince raiſed up from the Eaſt a new race of men unknown to hiſtory before, whom he calls Ammonites, and by whom (as he ſuppoſed) Aſia was almoſt every where overſpread, altho' in fact it is no eaſy matter to prove their exiſtence any where; ſo now, through a ſimilar fondeſs for novel inventions, has Dr. Prieſtley in like manner brought forth to the notice of the public, a new ſet of primitive Chriſtians (as he calls them) whom he ſtyles Unitarians, and whom he maintains to have prevailed almoſt univerſally in the firſt two or three centuries of Chriſtianity; but of whom

whom in fact no traces can be discovered before the middle of the third century, if even then: and yet (as Dr. P. contends,) the Apostles themselves had been of this Unitarian class of believers in the mere humanity of Jesus, and also their immediate disciples both among the Jews and Gentiles, and moreover the chief part of Christian Sectaries as well as of those congregations commonly reputed orthodox Christians, except indeed (as he allows) the more philosophic and speculative part of the Christian *Fathers* themselves about the time of Justin Martyr, in the 140th year of Christ.

This system of innovation in Christianity gives rise however to a different kind of enquiry in one respect from what was requisite to refute Mr. Lindsey's, and indeed it produces a kind of schism in Unitarianism: For hereby, Dr. P gives up one of the chief tenets of Mr. Lindsey as no longer teneable, namely, that the Christian *Fathers* as well as the Christian *Congregations* of the first two or three centuries, were generally believers in the *mere humanity* of Jesus *. Mr. Lindsey judged perhaps more rightly in conceiv-

* "The *Fathers* of the three first centuries, and consequently all Christian *people* for upwards of 300 years were generally Unitarians." *Lindsey's Apol. p.* 23.

ing,

ing, that the Chriſtian *people* could not well in that early age have held different tenets from their profeſſed *Teachers*, who were the means of their converſion; for few were then born Chriſtians in compariſon with the new converts from Heatheniſm. Dr. P. however, though thus differing from Mr. Lindſey, has aſſiſted in providing a mode of retreat for him from what he had too raſhly advanced; for perceiving by the proofs adduced by Mr. Burgh of the orthodoxy of all the *Fathers*, after the 140th year of Chriſt,* that Mr. Lindſey's poſt could be no longer maintained, he has attempted to place the pretenſions of Unitarians to Antiquity on a different but a narrower bottom; by retreating to that more early and darker period of 40 years, which intervened between the death of the Apoſtles and the 140th year, when Juſtin Martyr preſented his orthodox apology for Chriſtianity to the Emperor Antonius Pius on his acceſſion; which is the moſt antient Chriſtian writing extant, that is not liable to ſome doubt either with reſpect to its ſenſe or its being ſpurious or interpolated

* In his Scriptural Confutation of Mr. Lindſey's Apol. (1774)——And in an inquiry into the belief of the Chriſtians of the firſt three centuries; both by Mr. Burgh.

in

in later ages *. The poſition then, which Dr. P. has now choſen is, that the *Fathers* and Chriſtian *Congregations* were all Unitarians *before* the 140th year, and that the *Congregations* indeed remained the ſame long *after*; but that the *Fathers* themſelves *about* that time, being miſled by Juſtin Martyr, and other philoſophical converts from Platoniſm, then firſt corrupted Chriſtianity bythe introduction of the tenet of the *Divinity* of Chriſt; yet that their *Congregations* nevertheleſs generally continued to be ſtill believers in what he thinks the more antient doctrine, that of his *mere humanity*, until the council of Nice in the 325th year of Chriſt. But this opinion is equally untenable, and perhaps, more paradoxical than Mr. Lindſey's, eſpecially when there is added to it (what is indeed no neceſſary part of it, but rather a burden, which they have themſelves inconſiderately laid upon the ſhoulders of Unitarianiſm) that the Ebionites and Nazarenes were the ſame people; and that they were really the true and original Chriſtians,

* In calling Juſtin's Apology orthodox, I mean no more than with reſpect to its aſſertion of the *Divinity* of Chriſt in ſome ſenſe and degree or other; whether if inclined moſt to the Athanaſian or (as Whitby contends in his *Diſquiſitiones Modeſtæ*) to the Arian idea of his divinity, is foreign to the queſtion; in either caſe Jeſus was conſidered by him as a *divinity*.

although

although afterwards deemed heretical, when the Chriſtian world had been corrupted by Juſtin Martyr; and other teachers of the of *Divinity* Chriſt; and moreover that theſe ſects were not conſidered as heretics by any of the Fathers of the firſt two centuries; together with many other ſuch like aſſertions, which require more than all Dr. P's ability to render them even plauſible. The chief advantage which Dr. P. has obtained by his retreat to an earlier age is, that he has hereby laid the ſcene of the pretended corruption of Chriſtianity in a darker age; which ariſes from the misfortune, that moſt of the many Chriſtian writings about the 140th year have periſhed: ſo that through the little evidence extant on either ſide of the queſtion, it is in ſome meaſure like fighting in the dark; and rendered more ſo by the conduct of modern reformers themſelves, in either not producing or not fairly repreſenting what little evidence has been preſerved concerning theſe ſubjects, both before and after the time of Juſtin Martyr. Nevertheleſs the orthodox think, and I believe may juſtly aſſert, that all the evidence, which does exiſt relative to the tenets held in the period *before* the 140th year, as well as *about* that time, and alſo *after* it, is wholly in favor of the *Divinity* of Chriſt: and that there is nothing

nothing to ſupport the contrary opinion, except conjectural concluſions, drawn from preſumptions raiſed upon very weak and precarious foundations. In order then the better to aſſiſt in bringing forth to view, and arranging ſuch evidence as does exiſt, and alſo in clearing it from miſrepreſentations of modern reformers of Chriſtianity, I ſhall throw together various remarks on the antient Chriſtian writers concerning the age in queſtion; not from any deſire of oppoſing the ſentiments of particular perſons, but for the benefit of thoſe, who being now involved in perplexity through unfair accounts, may, perhaps, end in religious ſcepticiſm, though they only began with a laudable curioſity; and alſo from a motive of candor towards thoſe antient Chriſtian Fathers themſelves, by giving them an opportunity to defend themſelves from the accuſations and miſconſtructions, with which they have been loaded: for, however ready modern reformers, and indeed others alſo, are to accuſe them of weakneſs, error, inconſiſtency, want of veracity, and almoſt every commendable quality, yet they are juſt as ready to appeal to ſuch teſtimony for any facts in their own favour; and indeed it is to the information of thoſe antients, that all parties are indebted for being now able to enquire

quire into the antiquity of their reſpective tenets by evidence derived almoſt from the fountain head. So that upon the whole, although remarks on *modern Books*, are neceſſarily introduced into the following examination of the ſubject, yet, it ought to be conſidered as *an impartial vindication of Chriſtian antiquity*, without any reſpect to the particular perſons or religious tenets of thoſe, who may have accidentally aſſiſted in keeping the true ſtate of things in antient times from the view of ſuch as may wiſh to know it. I ſhall, however, be ſtudious to avoid every thing, which has been already anticipated by Dr. Horſely, the Monthly Reviewer, or by Biſhop Bull and Stillingfleet before them *, unleſs when it may be neceſſary to make ſome additions, or to ſet the ſame things in a clearer light, or elſe when I differ from thoſe writers, which is but ſeldom; in ſhort I do not propoſe to include every thing upon the ſubject, but only to add a *Supplement* to what the public is already poſſeſſed of.

This retreat of modern reformers into an earlier and darker age, as the ſcene of the pretended corruption, they attribute to Chriſ-

* In his Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity, London, 1697.

tianity,

tianity, is indeed no new attempt; for Zwicker in his *Irenicum*, and other Socinian writers in England about that time, had ſuggeſted the ſame plan before; but they were oppoſed and refuted by Biſhop Bull, Stillingfleet and others: and the real truth will be found to be, that Paulus of Samoſata about the 260th year of Chriſt, or at earlieſt Artemon about 40 years ſooner, formed the oldeſt chriſtian ſects, to whom the Unitarians can any way look back as their founders; for it was thoſe ſectaries, who firſt maintained the chief tenet of modern reformers, concerning the mere humanity of Jeſus throughout his miniſtry and whole exiſtence on earth. If then modern reformers ſhall be thus found able to trace back their chief tenet to no earlier period than about the middle of the third century, it will follow, that they can form no plauſible pretenſions to its having been the original chriſtian doctrine derived from the Apoſtles; it can only in that caſe appear as having been an innovation in chriſtianity then firſt introduced by ſome ſpeculative men of a philoſophic and metaphyſical turn, who were diſſatisfied with the common chriſtian tenets; juſt as it has been revived by a ſimilar claſs of men in modern times. But the latter being deſirous however of a ſtill more early antiquity in favor of their opinion,

have raſhly advanced, that the chriſtians even before Artemon and Paulus had maintained the ſame tenet; and although this has been diſproved ſufficiently with reſpect to all the *fathers* themſelves (for as to unknown congregations how is it poſſible to know their tenets except from their teachers,) yet Zwicker and Dr. P. being unwilling to quit their appeal to high antiquity, have in their diſtreſs to find better evidence rather choſen to claim kindred with the heretical ſects of the Ebionites, Nazarenes and others, becauſe they were almoſt cotemporary with the Apoſtles, than come down ſo late as to the age of Artemon and Paulus for their firſt founders. Yet in fact the Ebionites and Nazarenes, though ſectaries, were not only believers in the *divinity* of Jeſus the Chriſt, but alſo actually *Polytheiſts*; and they agreed with Unitarian reformers in nothing more, than in holding the mere humanity of Jeſus at his *birth* and *untill* his union with the divinity of the Chriſt at baptiſm.* What ſtrange inconſiſtencies then do men in their zeal run into, and this even among philoſophical and metaphyſical ſpeculators as well as among the more practical portion of men, the poli-

* See my Introductory Diſcouſe prefixed to vol. iii. p. 16. in note: it will alſo be further confirmed afterwards under the article relative to the tenets of the Ebionites.

ticians

ticians and the vulgar! who would have expected, that defenders of the mere humanity of Jeſus would, at the very moment that they were harſhly imputing Polytheiſm to the orthodox, have voluntarily derived the deſcent of their own ſect from one, which held a *plurality* of Gods, together with the *divinity* as well as *pre-exiſtence* of Chriſt? Yet ſuch is the effect of a zeal for innovation! But that we may the better be able to diſcern the inſolidity and incoherence of all the teſtimonies adduced to aſcertain this pretended antiquity of the Unitarian tenets before the time of Artemon and Paulus, we may conſider all ſuch evidence as reducible to the *five* following claſſes.

*Diſtribution into five claſſes, of the evidence adduced by modern reformers in favor of the higher antiquity of Unitarianiſm than the age of Artemon or Paulus of Samoſata.*

THE *firſt* evidence, to which modern reformers appeal for the higher antiquity of belief in the mere humanity of Jeſus, than the age of Artemon and Paulus in the third century, is derived from *ſcripture* itſelf, and the *ſecond* from eccleſiaſtical *hiſtory* in general.* But in regard to the inſufficiency

* "That the antient Jewiſh Church muſt have held the opinion, that Chriſt was *ſimply a man*, and not either

of their pretences thus to derive evidence from ſcripture, this has been already inquired into by Dr. Randolph, Mr, Sheppard, Mr. Burgh and others: this portion then will not come within the compaſs of the preſent remarks.

Their *ſecond* claſs of evidence, which is drawn from eccleſiaſtic *hiſtory*, may be ſeperated into *four* kinds: for it muſt conſiſt either of an account of the tenets held by thoſe ancient chriſtian *fathers* and teachers before the age of Artemon, whoſe writings are ſtill exſtant: or elſe of ſuch teſtimony as thoſe fathers may occaſionally ſupply relative to the belief of the chriſtian *congregations* of their own times: or elſe of ſuch hiſtoric accounts as they may have preſerved in their own writings concerning the belief of thoſe *more antient* chriſtians than themſelves, who

God Almighty, or a ſuper angelic being may be concluded from its being the clear doctrine of *ſcripture*, and from the Apoſtles having taught no other——But there is ſufficient evidence of the ſame thing from *eccleſiaſtical hiſtory*." *Hiſt. Corrupt.* v. i. 6. "When the *hiſtorical* arguments in favor of proper Unitarianiſm, which have hitherto been very much over looked, ſhall be duly attended to, eſpecially that, which ariſes from the conſideration of the great body of the common people among chriſtians having thought that Chriſt was ſimply a *man inſpired of God*, and their having had no knowledge of his pre-exiſtence, the concluſion, that ſuch a general perſuaſion muſt have been derived from the Apoſtles having taught no other doctrine, will not be eaſily avoided. *Preface to Let. to* Dr. H. *part* 2 13.

flouriſhed

flouriſhed between the death of the Apoſtles and the age of Juſtin Martyr, in the 140th year of Chriſt: or laſtly, of ſuch evidence as can be collected from them concerning the tenets of the oldeſt Chriſtian *ſects*, reputed to be heretical, ſuch as the Gnoſtics, Nazarenes, Ebionites, Theodotians and others; ſome of which ſects modern reformers have erroneouſly conceived to have been the true and original Chriſtians, notwithſtanding that they were afterwards condemned as heretics, when Chriſtians had generally embraced the pretended corruption of Chriſtianity concerning the divinity of Jeſus; but which ſects nevertheleſs in the firſt ſtages towards that pretended corruption were (as they contend) not only treated with lenity, but alſo neither conſidered as actual heretics, nor expelled from Chriſtian Congregations.

Now in regard to the *firſt* of theſe *four* kinds of *hiſtoric* evidence, which includes the true ſtate of the tenets of the oldeſt Chriſtian *Fathers* ſtill exſtant, Mr. Lindſey had apparently ſuggeſted, that they were generally believers in the mere humanity of Jeſus; but he has been ſo ſufficiently refuted by Mr. Burgh and others, that Dr. Prieſtley has given up this evidence in favour of the antiquity of Unitarianiſm as no longer defenſible; and has thought proper to narrow the bottom of its

pretenſions

pretenſions to antiquity, by laying the ſcene of the ſuppoſed corruption in a ſtill earlier age than thoſe Chriſtian *Fathers* now extant. This portion then of hiſtoric teſtimony requires no farther refutation.

But in giving up this, Dr. P. maintains, that Juſtin Martyr, and others of the oldeſt Fathers now extant, were either the firſt or among the firſt, who introducedthe divinity of Jeſus. in imitation of the opinions of that favorite philoſopher of the heathens, Plato; for coming freſh from the ſtudy of his works when they became converts to Chriſtianity, they were led to corrupt it with a mixture of their former platonic notions: yet that they found it difficult, however, to infuſe the ſame opinions into their Chriſtian *congregations* of the lower ranks; of which fact the writings of thoſe Fathers themſelves contain (as they contend) ſufficient evidence in various acknowledgements to that purport, which have incidentally dropt from their pens *. The collection then of all ſuch paſſages, and the examination, whether they are ſufficient to eſtabliſh the ſuppoſed facts, forms the *ſecond* claſs of *hiſtoric* teſtimony, to which

* "In the beginning of the third century the divinity of Chriſt was far from being generally received except by the Biſhops and the more learned of the Clergy." *Preface to Letters to Dr. H. part. 2. p. 74.*

modern

modern reformers appeal for the antiquity of their own tenet concerning the mere humanity of Jeſus. But as in this point Dr. P. chiefly follows the opinion of Zwicker, whoſe proofs have been refuted by Biſhop Bull, and Stillingfleet formerly, and lately by Dr. Horſley, and the Monthly Reviewer, I ſhall have ſeldom any remarks to make on this ſubject. I may only obſerve now in general, that according to Zwicker, this corruption was effected by *Juſtin and his ſucceſſors*; * but Dr. P. ſeems rather to carry the ſcene of the corruption ſtill *farther back* into that darker period of about 40 years between the death of St. John and Juſtin Martyr †: in another paſſage, however, he ſuggeſts, that it had made little progreſs until *after* the time of Juſtin ‡, whoſe chriſtian courſe did not continue above 10 or 20 years, after preſenting his apology, and before his martyrdom.

" * Per Juſtinum & ejus *ſequaces*."

" † I think it probable, that Juſtin was either the firſt, or *one of the firſt*, who advanced the doctrine of the permanent perſonality of the Logos." *Lett. to Dr. H. part* 1. 134.

" ‡ It is probable, that though ſome of the works of Juſtin Martyr, might perhaps have been extant, when the writer of the Clementines was employed about his, they were but little known, or his opinions might have been adopted by few perſons only." *Pref. to Lett. to Dr. H. part* 2. 9.

The

The *third* claſs of evidence, appealed to by modern reformers, conſiſts of ſuch accounts as the oldeſt Fathers have preſerved relative to the ſtate of Chriſtian belief in times *preceding* their own and that of Juſtin Martyr during the ſhort and obſcure period of 40 years between the death of St. John in the 98th year of Chriſt and the acceſſion of Antoninus Pius, in the 138th; about which time Juſtin preſented his apology *in the name* of all Chriſtians, wherein he uniformly conſiders Jeſus as a *divinity*. But by divinity obſerve, that I mean any degree of divinity, whether that of the Son being equal to the Father, as according to the orthodox; or of his being an inferior or ſubordinate divinity, either created or begotten before the creation of the univerſe, as according to the tenets of the Ebionites and, perhaps, Nazarenes, the Gnoſtics, Theodotians and Arians. Such different degrees of divinity make no difference in the ſtate of the queſtion, whether Jeſus was held to be *divine* or only a *mere man* enabled (as modern reformers contend) to prophecy and work miracles by the power of God, occaſionally extended to him and working in him: neither is it of any importance at what time the union of divinity and humanity took place in Jeſus Chriſt, whether at his incarnation or not until his

his baptiſm; in any of thoſe caſes he was ſtill not *merely* a man during his miſſion. Another neceſſary obſervation to prevent ambiguity is concerning thoſe names *unitarian* and *unitarianiſm*. What names indeed any claſs of men employ, whether proper or not, is of little moment, in caſe we do but comprehend preciſely what they mean: but in the preſent inſtance theſe names lead to confuſion, becauſe they are employed by Mr. Lindſey and Dr. P. in more extenſive ſenſes at ſome times than at others. In the quotation from Mr. Lindſey, at p. 3, in note, by *unitarians* is meant a great variety of ſects, Arians, Ebionites, Theodotians, Sabellians and Socinians, in ſhort any ſect, which has pretended to preſerve the unity of the Deity better than the *trinitarians* according to the council of Nice; to which name alone *unitarian* is there ſet in oppoſition: but in note, at p. 12, by *proper unitarianiſm*, Dr. P. means the doctrine of only one out of that long catalogue of ſects, viz. of thoſe who maintain the *mere humanity* of Chriſt; in order therefore to prevent the ambiguity ariſing from ſuch different ſenſes of the ſame words, and conſequently the neceſſity of frequent explanations and repetitions, I ſhall hereafter drop thoſe names and uſe the more pre-

ciſe appellations of *humaniſts* and *humaniſm*. But with reſpect to *pre-exiſtence*, the belief of that alone, without the addition of ſome degree of *divinity*, is not ſufficient to prove Jeſus more than *merely human*; for both Carpocrates and the Valentinian Gnoſtics believed his pre-exiſtence, and the latter his miraculous conception, nevertheleſs they conſidered him as nothing but *mere man* until after his union with the *divine* Chriſt at baptiſm*. I mention theſe particulars becauſe Dr. P. ſeems generally to include no other ideas under *divinity*, when applied to Chriſt, than the orthodox tenets of conceiving the Son equal to the Father, and an union of divinity and humanity at the incarnation of Jeſus: but the Heretics might differ from the orthodox both in regard to the *degree* of Chriſt's divinity and alſo the *time* of its union with humanity, or even the orthodox might differ in theſe points with one another; and yet all nevertheleſs agree in acknowledging Jeſus to be

* Dr. P. aſſerts, "that Cerinthus, Carpocrates, and other Gnoſtics denied the miraculous conception," *Letter to Dr. H. part* 2. *p.* 58. now if under *other Gnoſtics* he included the Valentinians as not being believers in the miraculous conception, it is a miſtake; and the Valentinians were the moſt numerous as well as moſt reputable claſs of the Gnoſtics.

divine

divine during his *miniſtry*, and not merely human. Concerning this third claſs, I ſhall have ſome remarks to make.

There ſtill remains a *fourth* claſs of *hiſtoric* evidence, appealed to Zwicker as well as by Dr. P. to prove the antiquity of *Humaniſm*, which is that drawn from the tenets held by the antient *ſectaries*, particularly the Ebionites and Nazarenes, whom they conſider as the true and original chriſtians: I ſhall not object to the impropriety of thus proving what were the original tenets of the orthodox, by the tenets held among declared Heretics; becauſe they ſuppoſe an inverſion to have taken place, and that thoſe, who were in later times declared Heretics, were originally the true believers; but then there ought to be ſome better proof of this inverſion than an arbitrary ſuppoſition. It is therefore to the pretended *fact* itſelf which I object, namely, that the Ebionites and Nazarenes alſo (ſo far as the tenets of the latter can be now diſcovered) did ever really hold the tenet imputed to them concerning the *mere humanity* of Jeſus, in the ſenſe of modern reformers, as continuing *during his miniſtry*, as well as before it: on the contrary, they were believers in the *divinity* of the *Chriſt*, altho' indeed they conſidered him as a ſub-

ordinate divinity like the Arians; and differed chiefly from the latter, in ſuppoſing the union of divinity and humanity not to have taken place before the *baptiſm* of Jeſus, which the Arians like the orthodox aſcribed to the time of his *incarnation*. This then is the portion of eccleſiaſtic hiſtory, to which my remarks will chiefly relate; and which aim to prove, that while our modern reformers conceive the Chriſtian world to have been over-run with Unitarians in the firſt two centuries both among the *orthodox* and *Sectaries*; yet, that in reality there is no evidence preſerved of a ſingle Unitarian, *i. e.* believer in the mere humanity of Jeſus the Chriſt during *his miniſtry*, having ever exiſted even among the *Sectaries* themſelves, before Artemon and Paulus in the middle of the third century: for that all thoſe more early ſects, whom modern reformers have taken for Unitarians, *i. e.* believers in the mere humanity of Chriſt, were in reality believers in him as a ſubordinate Deity, and in effect Polytheiſts. This is a ſubject ſcarcely ſo much as hitherto touched on to my knowledge by any preceeding writer*.

* Mr. Maty, in his Review for January 1785, mentions, that Doderlein wrote a tract in Latin to prove, that

The origin of the miſtake made by reformers in this portion of hiſtoric evidence, has been as follows; in reading Auguſtine's Epitome of Hereſies, or perhaps Epiphanius and others, they have found the Ebionites and other Sectaries to be mentioned there as believing Jeſus to have been *mere man*, and this phraſe they have miſunderſtood to mean *always mere man, during* his miniſtry as well as *before* it: Auguſtine's brevity in mentioning only ſome *one* conſpicuous part of the tenets of moſt Sectaries, and omitting the *remainder*, does not enable a reader to diſcover the *whole* of their religious ſyſtems; but in Epiphanius and other antient Chriſtians who have been more full in their accounts, it becomes very evident: for we there find, that notwithſtanding the Ebionites, or any other ſect of that age maintained Jeſus to have been *mere man* at his birth, yet they nevertheleſs aſſerted, that the divine pre-exiſtent Chriſt was united to him at baptiſm, and that after this Jeſus ceaſed to be *mere man**. Hence it becomes

that the Ebionites believed in the divinity of Chriſt: I could wiſh for an opportunity to read it.

* See my introductory Diſcourſe to vol. 3, at p. 16 in note, ſo far as reſpects the Ebionites; the ſame tenets may be ſeen in Epiphanius to have been held

plain, that *mere man* referred in their idea to nothing more than a queſtion agitated in that age concerning the *time*, when the union of divinity and humanity took place; the Sectaries generally affirming that it was not until baptiſm, conſequently that Jeſus was *mere man* at his birth, and until the divine Chriſt deſcended and formed that ſame union, which the orthodox believed to have been formed at the incarnation of Jeſus. This then was one chief ſubject of difference between thoſe Sectaries and the orthodox; and hence they were neceſſarily led to form a diſtinction between *Jeſus* and *the Chriſt*, whom they conſidered as two different beings until the baptiſm; or as Irenæus expreſſes it, *Seperant Jeſum a Chriſto* [*p.* 120]: whereas the orthodox now, and alſo in antient times, uſed Jeſus and *Chriſt* as ſynonimous names; becauſe in their opinion *Jeſus* became the *Chriſt* from his very incarnation. Hence the Fathers render the meaning of thoſe Sectaries often very perplexed, by inadvertently ſubſtituting *Chriſtum* for *Jeſum* (becauſe theſe were ſynonimous words among the orthodox themſelves) and modern writers, both orthodox

held by moſt of the Gnoſtics, the Cerinthians and others; as will be ſhewn particularly afterwards.

and

and Unitarians have committed the ſame fault; which is the frequent cauſe of much confuſion in the reaſoning of both. Thus the author of the additions to Tertullian *de preſcriptione*, ſays, concerning Theodotus, "*Chriſtum* hominem tantummodo diceret, deum autem illum negaret;" which is a tenet totally inconſiſtent with the theology of Theodotus, who maintained the divinity of the Chriſt at his deſcent and union with the human Jeſus at baptiſm, like the Ebionites: this however may not appear altogether clear from the account of Theodotus in Epiphanius; yet it is ſufficiently proved by the extracts preſerved by Clemens of Alexandria, concerning which many miſtakes have been made by Dr. P. and others. The above writer then meant only to ſay, that according to Theodotus, *Jeſus was mere man and not God*; but inadvertently through his own orthodox prepoſſeſſions put down *Chriſtum*, inſtead of *Jeſum*; that is, he had no idea of any poſſible diſtinction or diviſion of thoſe two names, or that the beings expreſſed by them could be different before their union at baptiſm. Euſebius has fallen in to the very ſame inaccurate expreſſion relative to the Ebionites themſelves, and Jerom likewiſe; indeed all the Fathers without exception at times. But in the

ſame

ſame moment this proves the ſtrong pre-poſſeſſion in the minds of the moſt antient fathers now extant of the *divinity* of Jeſus at his incarnation; and in like manner the continual oppoſition, which ſubſiſts among the Sectaries between *Jeſus* and the *Chriſt*, proves as ſtrongly their own uniformity in aſcribing divinity to the latter, notwithſtanding they allowed only *humanity* to the former at his birth: which two, when become united at baptiſm, formed, according to thoſe Sectaries, the very ſame *compound* being of divinity and humanity, as in the idea of the orthodox at the incarnation; except with reſpect to the ſubordinate degree of divinity, which thoſe Sectaries attributed to the *Chriſt*; in this they differed very little from the Arians, who held a middle doctrine between the more ſupreme divinity attributed to Chriſt by the orthodox, and the more ſubordinate one of the older Sectaries. Any reader of the Fathers, who ſhall not carry this key along with him, will find himſelf involved at every ſtep in eternal confuſion; but with the help of ſuch a full view of *all* the tenets of the ſectaries, the whole will appear ſufficiently intelligible and conſiſtent both in the reaſonings of the Fathers themſelves, and in their accounts of the tenets of thoſe Sectaries

ries: and it will convince any impartial man, that no ſuch queſtion was ever agitated among them (before Artemon, even if then) as whether the Chriſt was a Divinity or not; but only at what time the divine Chriſt deſcended and took humanity upon him, whether ſooner or later in the life of Jeſus;* and that all agreed in allowing *the Chriſt* to have been divine *during* his miſſion, as well as *before* and *after* it. But moſt of the ſectaries went ſtill further into the opinion of the orthodox than by allowing the divinity of Chriſt during his miniſtry; for they even acknowledged the miraculous conception of Jeſus, altho' they nevertheleſs affirmed the produce of it to be nothing but *mere man*; yet they conſidered him as ſuperior to the common claſs of men: thus the Valentinian Gnoſtics allowed, that this human produce *Jeſus* became in conſequence of his miraculous

* This ſufficiently appears by what Irenæus ſays of the Valentinians, "Confirmare volunt (Valentiniani) deſcenſionem *Chriſti* & aſcenſionem ex *eo* [*Jeſu* ante paſſionem] quod, neque *ante baptiſmum* neque poſt reſurrectionem a mortuis aliquid magni feciſſe *Jeſum*, dicant diſcipuli." *Lib.* 1. 34.

In this he only ſpoke the common ſentiments of the ſectaries, which while they tend to prove their belief of the humanity of Jeſus before baptiſm, equally prove their belief of the divinity of Jeſus the Chriſt after baptiſm.

conception *a more wiſe, pure and juſt man*, therefore more fit for the reception of the Chriſt.* Theodotus allowed the ſame, and perhaps Artemon meant nothing different; although indeed the words of Theodoret may have ſomething ambiguous in them.† It muſt be acknowledged however, that Theodoret and other Chriſtian fathers may have inadvertently been the cauſe of the error in modern reformers concerning

* "*Jeſum* autem, quippe ex virgine per operationem Dei generatum, ſapientiorem & mundiorem & juſtiorem hominibus omnibus fuiſſe; *Chriſtum*, perplexum *Sophiæ*, deſcendiſſe, & ſic factum eſſe *Jeſum Chriſtum*." *Irenæus*, 1. 34.

† "Theodotus dixit——[Jeſum] ex ſpiritu quidem ſancto natum ex virgine, ſed hominem nudum, nulla alia præ ceteris *niſi ſola juſtitiæ* auctoritate. "*Tertulliani continuater de Preſcr. Hæret. c.* 53.

According to Theodoret Artemon maintained the ſame opinion concerning Jeſus, viz. that he was born of a virgin, and ſuperior to the Prophets in virtue—— Ιησεν εκ παρθενου γεγενημενον, των δε προφητων αρετη κρειττονα. *Hæret. Fab.* 2. *c.* 4.

Philaſtrius attributes the very ſame doctrine to Ebion concerning *Jeſus* at his birth, for that his words can only refer to Jeſus *before* his baptiſm is evident from Epiphanius's account of Ebion's belief of the deſcent of the *Divine Chriſt*. "Hebion——nihil divinitatis in eo [Jeſu] fuiſſe docebat, ſed ſicut omnes prophetas ſic & eum gratiam Dei habuiſſe adſerebat." *De Hebione*. He had not improbably in his view the caſe of Samuel and other prophets in their youth: Euſebius confirms that Ebion conſidered Jeſus as *hominem* δικαιωμενον.

the

the real tenets of the Ebionites; for thoſe fathers alſo ſpeak of them as deniers of the *divinity* of *Chriſt*; but then here again, juſt as I have pointed out before, they meant by *Chriſt* the ſame as *Jeſus*; therefore meant to aſſert no more, than that the Ebionites denied the divinity of *Jeſus* at his birth; which was true. As to that ſubordinate divinity, which the Ebionites allowed to Jeſus afterwards in conſequence of his union with the ſubordinate divinity of Chriſt, the Fathers ſeem to have conſidered this as a matter of too little moment even to mention, much leſs as capable to attone for the heretical tenet held by the Ebionites, relative to the humanity of Jeſus at his birth: and in truth it was of little importance toward rendering them really orthodox; yet was very ſufficient for our preſent purpoſe, that is, to prove that the Ebionites differed *eſſentially* from Unitarians, who maintain the mere humanity of *the Chriſt*, as well as of *Jeſus*, that is, the mere humanity of *Jeſus the Chriſt* during his *miniſtry* as well as *before it*.

Now in regard to the *motives*, which might have induced the oldeſt chriſtian ſectaries, viz. three, and thoſe the moſt reputable ſets of the Gnoſtics, the Ebionites, Theodotians, and perhaps the Nazarenes,

along with others, to prefer the divine Chriſt's union with the human Jeſus at Baptiſm, to the orthodox tenet of their union at Incarnation, this ſeems to have been in order to ennoble (as they conceived) the human ſubject prepared to be united to the divine Chriſt during his miniſtry, and not from any view of abaſing him or denying divinity to him, as modern reformers have miſconceived. Their general opinion on this ſubject is by Juſtin Martyr thus put into the mouth of the Jew Trypho, and might have been common to the unbelieving Jews and chriſtian ſectaries, "It is incredible that Divinity ſubmitted to be born,"* which opinion is thus more fully and particularly expreſſed by the orthodox perſonator of Ignatius in his cenſures of the Gnoſtic Sectaries. "Parva tibi videntur cunabula, paſſiones, circumciſio, lactis nutritio; indigna tibi hæc Deo eſſe videntur, quid vero peſſimas naturam virginis & membra turpia vocas?"† Manicheiſm was chiefly a revival of the Polytheiſm of the Gnoſtics and other oldeſt Chriſtian Sectaries,

* Απισον—ὁτι θεος υπομεινε γενηθηναι. *P.* 292.

† Μικρα γαρ σοι δοκει σπαργανα, παθη, περιτομη, γαλακτοτροφια· αναξια σοι ταυτα κατα θεε κατεφαινετο—τι δε κακιζεις την φυσιν της παρθενος, και τα μορια αποκαλεις αισχρα; *ad Phillip.*

and

and among other articles, Manes retained alſo the opinion of its being more noble for the divine Chriſt to be united to the man Jeſus at his baptiſm, in the maturity of life and reaſon, than at the conception of Jeſus.* The modern Unitarians have likewiſe revived in this, and in many other points the Gnoſticiſm or affected ſpeculative philoſophy of the firſt ages, as may be ſeen at large in Mr. Lindſey's late hiſtory of Unitarians; without conſidering that ſimilar objections (if they deſerve that name) both may be, and actually have been levelled by Woolſton and other declared Unbelievers, againſt *that very mode* in which the *divine power* was communicated and diſplayed during the miniſtry of Jeſus, even

* Και μη τον μονογενη τον εκ των κολπων τυ πατρος καταβαντα Χριϛον Μαριας τινος γυναικος ελεγον ειναι υἱον, εξ αιματος και σαρκος, και της αλλης δυσωδιας των γυναικων γεγενησθαι. *Manichæi ad Marcellum epiſtola apud Epiphanium. lib.* 2. *Hær.* 66. Nec [utinam] unigenitum Chriſtum de ſinu patris deſcenſum Mariæ cujuſdam mulieris filium eſſe dicerent [orthodoxi] atque ex ſanguine carneque, & reliquo mulierum fœtore prodiiſſe: Thus we find, that the ſectaries adhered not to what the Scriptures related, or the firſt Chriſtians believed, but they adopted ſuch tenets as appeared to their own ſpeculative opinion the moſt proper mode of a divine revelation; a method which modern Unitarians have revived among other articles of the Gnoſtic philoſophy.

upon

upon the plan of the Unitarians themſelves; the objections then which Mr. Lindſey there adopts from the Gnoſtics, and alſo Dr. P. in many places, againſt the orthodox belief of an union of Divinity with the humanity of Jeſus during his infancy, muſt either prove too little for their own ſyſtem, or too much for thoſe who profeſs ſtill to retain a belief in the Chriſtian revelation.

To the ſame purport of ennobling the miniſtry of the Chriſt tended alſo thoſe tenets of the Valentinians and of the other ſectaries, which related to a miraculous conception, namely, in order to prepare thereby a more extraordinary, pure, wiſe, and juſt humanity in the perſon of Jeſus, as a fitter receptacle for the divine Chriſt at baptiſm:* but then in all this we find nothing of any denial of the divinity of Chriſt, and of its being united to the humanity of

* It is really wonderful that defenders of Humaniſm are ſo careleſs concerning the truth of the principles and facts, from which they draw concluſions. Thus the author of *Obſervations on the miraculous Conception* in the *Theol. Repoſitory, vol.* 4. *numb.* 3. 268, follows implicitely the error of Dr. P. "The Gnoſtics (ſays he) to whoſe peculiar ſyſtems the miraculous conception could not but have appeared exceedingly favorable, did likewiſe reject it as fabulous." See this refuted in note 1, p. 26. above.

Jeſus;

Jeſus; but quite the contrary, namely, a concerted ſyſtem of preparation to ennoble that union as much as poſſible; it was, in fact, only a different mode of aſſerting the actual divinity of Jeſus the Chriſt during his miniſtry, and (as they thought) more conſiſtent with the dignity of Divinity. But modern reformers have inconſiderately miſtaken the ſhadow, the attendant circumſtances, for the ſubſtance of the belief of the Ebionites and other ſectaries. We ſee therefore upon the whole, that the antient Chriſtian ſectaries reprobated orthodoxy, chiefly for not being (as they pretended) ſufficiently noble, complex, and ſublime, with reſpect to the dignity of Chriſt; whereas, modern reformers have taken the oppoſite road, and have condemned it as being too complex and ſublime; and for that reaſon, as they conclude, never received by the ordinary ranks of Chriſtians during the firſt three centuries, but only by the more learned of the clergy: ſince then it has been thus condemned for oppoſite faults, a good preſumption ariſes hence of there being no ſolid foundation for theſe cenſures on either ſide; and indeed it is no uncommon caſe for metaphyſical reaſoning to reaſon itſelf, in the ſublimity of its ſpeculations, out of all common as well

as

as conſiſtent reaſon both in merely human and divine ſubjects.

Thus have I ſtated *in general* to what portions of *hiſtoric* evidence my remarks will be chiefly directed, and how far the *object* of them differs from what has already been made public by others; and moreover what have been the *nature* and apparent *cauſe* of the errors into which modern reformers have fallen, in appealing to the tenets of the Ebionites for proof of the higher antiquity of Unitarianiſm than the age of Artemon and Paulus; when in reality the doctrine of the Ebionites proves only the different *modes* of Chriſtian belief, which ſubſiſted in the firſt ages relative to the *divinity* of Chriſt *during his miniſtry*, together with the high antiquity of Arianiſm and Polytheiſm among the oldeſt chriſtian Sectaries. We will therefore now proceed to a more *particular* conſideration of the tenets held by the moſt antient Chriſtian Sectaries, eſpecially thoſe whom modern Humaniſts look up to as their founders, and affect to ſtyle *antient Unitarians*, ſuch as the Jews, Ebionites, Nazarenes, Theodotians, &c. but whom we ſhall in fact find to have been actually Polytheiſts, and to have held the ſame opinion with the Cerinthian,

thian, Carpocratian and Valentinian Gnoſtics, ſo far as reſpects the deſcent of a ſubordinate but divine Chriſt and his union with Jeſus at his baptiſm.

*The Jews.*

What the real opinion of the Jews was, concerning the Divinity or humanity of their expected Meſſiah is a ſubject involved in ſome darkneſs, on account of our having no Jewiſh writings preſerved of ſo early an age as that of Chriſt: unleſs the two Chaldee Paraphraſes, that on the Pentateuch by Onkelos, and on the Prophets by Jonathan, be of ſo antient a date; which is indeed poſitively affirmed by the Jews themſelves, and maintained by many learned Chriſtians; to which opinion alſo nothing material has been objected, and only ſome doubts and ſuſpicions: but even if thoſe paraphraſes were not ſo antient, yet it is preſumeable, that they were compoſed in conformity to ſuch explications of Scripture, as had been currently received among the Jews; ſo that they may truely repreſent the ſentiments of the Jews, not only at the time they were compoſed, but alſo in more antient times than that of

their compoſition. Now theſe paraphraſes are ſo far from giving countenance to the aſſertion of modern humaniſts, that the Jews expected their Meſſiah to be merely human; that on the contrary they explain all prophetic paſſages concerning the Meſſiah in ſuch a ſtrain of pompous expreſſion, as gives a ſtrong preſumption, yet indeed no direct proof, of their believing, that Divinity was in ſome mode, and at ſome time or other to be connected with the humanity of the Meſſiah. Thus for inſtance among many others, in that paſſage of Iſaiah, ix. 6. "the mighty God, the prince of peace" this is explained by the paraphraſe of Jonathan as being predictive of the Meſſiah, in theſe words, "Appellatum eſt nomen ejus *Deus fortis*, permanens *in æternum*, Meſſias, cujus pax multiplicabitur ſuper nos in diebus ejus." Now how far the Jews underſtood *Deus* here and *in æternum* in literal ſenſes, and how far only as hyperbolic expreſſions, when thus applied to the Meſſiah, it is indeed impoſſible for us at this diſtance of time to determine, with ſo little remains in our hands of Jewiſh literature: but then it is equally impoſſible for Dr. P. to affirm as a thing *certain*, that the Jews believed their Meſ-

Meſſiah to be *merely human.** The only other Jewiſh evidence exſtant, of ſo early an age, is Philo Judæus, and he again favors the opinion, that the Jews believed in the Divinity of their Meſſiah; for Cudworth and Le Clerc agree, "that Philo makes mention of a ſecond God, whom he termed Λογος"†: Philo lived during the very age of Chriſt, and wrote within a dozen years after his death. To theſe teſtimonies I may add, that Cerinthus and all other Chriſtian ſectaries, who adhered to Judaiſm, ſuch as the Ebionites, Nazarenes, Oſſenes and Elceſaites will be found, as I ſhall prove, to have believed in the Divinity of the

* "The ſtyle and rank of *God* given to Chriſt made a ſyſtem *intirely different* from that of the Jews, as laid down in the Old Teſtament" *Hiſt. corrupt. p.* 59. "No Jew had originally *any Idea* of their Meſſiah being more than man." *Lett. to Dr. H. part* 1. 141. Now altho' the firſt of theſe aſſertions were ever ſo true, that the *Old Teſtament itſelf* does not attribute Divinity to the Meſſiah, yet it does not follow hence, that the ſecond is true; for the Jews might eaſily miſtake the meaning of the old Teſtament, and if not, yet through time both philoſophic and popular belief might have introduced opinions concerning the Meſſiah not warranted by the Old Teſtament.

† Philon, tout Juif qu'il étoit, a parlé d'un *ſecond* Dieu." *Bibl. chois.* tom. 3. 87. He ſtyles this ſubordinate Divinity, Τον ορθον του θεου Λογον πρωτογονον υιον—— Κυριος, ὁς αρχει και κρατει παντος τε πεποιημενου—Αρχαγγελος και πρεσβυταλος Λογος, &c.

Chriſt: does not a preſumption ariſe hence, that they might juſt as well have brought this tenet along with them into Chriſtianity from a Jewiſh ſource, as have learnt it afterwards from the apoſtolic doctrine? but at leaſt is it not probable either that they muſt have brought it with them out of Judaiſm, or elſe have learnt it from the Apoſtles? rather than that ſo many different ſects ſhould have *all* agreed to go to the Heathens, to borrow a tenet for their Chriſtian ſyſtems neither recommended by Judaiſm nor (as the Humaniſts affirm) by original Chriſtianity: but whenceſoever they acquired it, the *univerſal* reception of it by all thoſe chriſtianizing Jews, ſeems to confirm, that the Jews themſelves could not probably have been very averſe before from ſuch a belief concerning their Meſſiah. All then that can be pronounced *certain* concerning this ſubject is, that the oldeſt Chriſtian Fathers allow it to have been the belief of the Jews, that the Meſſiah ſhould be *born* mere man of the lineage of David. But here the Humaniſts run in the ſame error, as concerning the Ebionites, if they conclude hence, that the Jews never ſuppoſed, that divinity was to be communicated to him afterwards at his election, unction and deſignation to his office: for the caſe was the very ſame with the

Ce-

Cerinthian, Carpocratian and Valentinian Gnoſtics, and indeed with the Ebionites, Nazarenes and Theodotians likewiſe; for although all theſe ſects allowed the mere *humanity* of Jeſus at his birth, yet this did not prevent any of them from believing *divinity* to have been communicated to him afterwards at his *election*, *baptiſm*, and *deſignation* to the Office of Meſſiah or Chriſt*: how then can it be ſuppoſed to prevent the Jews from adopting the ſame mode of belief? accordingly in fact the account which the Jew Trypho gives, in Juſtin's Socratic Dialogue, of ſuch chriſtianity as he ſeems not unwilling to adopt, has a very ſtriking reſemblance to the tenets of the above mentioned Sectaries concerning the Chriſt.† It is not indeed expreſſly ſaid here, that any communication of Divinity was

* Ιησουν γεγενημενον εκ σ περμαΐος ανδρος λεγουσι [Εβιωναιοι] και επιλεχθενΐα, και ὥΐω καΐα εκλογην ὑιον θεϰ κληθεντα, απο του ανωθεν εις αυΐον ἠκονΐος Χριστου εν ειδει περισΐερας. Jeſum ex virili ſemine productum affirmant [Ebionæi] & *electum* & ſic per electionem *filium Dei* appellatum, a Chriſto, qui ex cœlo in eum delapſus eſt figura columbæ. *Epiph. de Ebione.* To this important paſſage in Epiphanius concerning the tenets of Ebion, add that in the note to p. 16. of *Introd. Diſcourſe.*

† "*They*, who think, that Jeſus was a man, and being *elected* of God was *anointed* Chriſt, appear to me to advance a more probable opinion than yours [that of the orthodox] for all of us [Jews] expect, that Chriſt will be *born* a man from man, and that Elias will come to *anoint* him."

con-

conſidered by the Jews as included in this *election* and *unction* to the office of Chriſt; but then neither is there any thing affirmed to the contrary; and ſince Trypho expreſſly approves here of the belief of *ſome* chriſtian ſects then exiſting, apparently ſome or other of thoſe above-mentioned (for we know of no other) it ſeems to follow, that he never meant to object to any other part of the orthodox belief, if it had but ſuppoſed Jeſus to have been *born* mere man, although it ſhould have allowed him, as the Ebionites did, to have been united to Divinity after his election. But why indeed ſhould it be ſuppoſed, that Trypho as a Jew, had any objection to a communication of Divinity to Jeſus at his election, when we find ſuch learned Jewiſh authors as Philo teaching a very ſimilar doctrine in that very age, when Chriſtianity appeared? For Philo not only allowed of a ſubordinate Divinity, to whom he gave the ſame title of Λογος along with theſe Chriſtian ſects above-mentioned; but he alſo maintained, that this Λογος was neque ingenitus ut Deus, neque genitus ut nos, ſed *medius inter extrema inter utroſque obſidem agens*; apud *Creatorem* quidem, ut fidem ei faciat nunquam corruptum iri & defecturum totum genus humanum, perturbationem ordini præferens; apud *creaturam* verò, ut bonam

ei

ei ſpem præbeat nunquam benignum Deum neglecturum opus ſuum*": and in other places he ſpeaks of the Λογος as deſcending among men επικουριας ἑνεκα και συμμαχιας. (De Somniis, p. 587.) Here we find the ſeeds of Chriſtianity intermixed perhaps with Platoniſm, but exiſting even in Jewiſh theology itſelf, before the apoſtles had ſpread Chriſtianity among the heathens: out of which general maſs, the firſt Chriſtian ſects compoſed their ſeveral ſyſtems of belief, and blended them with that purer doctrine of Chriſt, which the orthodox alone retained. Could Trypho himſelf have more aptly deſcribed the office of Meſſiah or Chriſt, than by Philo's account of the office and nature of the divine Λογος, as a hoſtage, divine meſſenger and mediator between God and man? And have we any reaſon to ſuppoſe that ſuch Jewiſh Theology was peculiar to Philo, becauſe he happens to be the only author of Jewiſh theology, whoſe works have been preſerved? Or can any ſincere enquirer after truth affirm as *certain*,

* Ουτε αγγεννητος ὡς ὁ Θεος ων, ουτε γεννητος ὡς ἡμεις, αλλα μεσος των ακρων, αμφοτεροις ὁμηρευων· παρα τω μεν Φυτευσαντι, προς πιστιν του μη συμπαν αφανισαι ποτε και αποστηναι το γενος, ακοσμιαν αντι κοσμου ἑλομενον· παρα δε τω Φυντι προς ευελπιστιαν του μηποτε τον ιλεων Θεον περιιδειν το ιδιον εργον.

that

that Trypho and other Jews allowed of no participation of Divinity and humanity in the perſon of their Meſſiah, after his election and deſignation, when we find ſuch doctrines as theſe exiſting in Jewiſh theology in the very age of Chriſt? Or can one conſiſtently with candor impute to the orthodox of ſo late an age as Juſtin, the introduction of a ſuppoſed intermixture of Platoniſm and Judaiſm with Chriſtian ideas, which is thus conſpicuouſly proved to have exiſted one hundred years before Juſtin, and to have been coeval with Chriſt himſelf, probably alſo ſtill much more antient. Hence ſome of the firſt Chriſtians were led to maintain, (I believe Juſtin himſelf) that Plato borrowed his notions from the Jews; but whether that was the caſe, or contrariwiſe, that the Jewiſh doctors had become as much enamoured of Plato as the Heathens; or, that both borrowed from ſome common Oriental ſource: yet, any way, theſe two facts are clear, that the intermixture of Platoniſm with Jewiſh and Chriſtian theology, which Humaniſts impute to Juſtin, had a more antient origin, even than Chriſtianity itſelf; and alſo, that there is no ſufficient reaſon to attribute to the Jews ſuch a purity of belief concerning the unity of the Deity, or concerning the

mere

mere humanity of the Meſſiah, as Dr. P. pretends; whoſe notions of Jewiſh belief, are only drawn from what he thinks to have been dictated by the Jewiſh ſacred ſcriptures, and not from the current popular theology, which actually prevailed among the Jews in the age of Chriſt.

It may however be ſtill perhaps objected againſt theſe teſtimonies from Philo concerning the Divinity of the Meſſiah, that altho' indeed he does allow Divinity to the chief *Logos*; yet it does not ſufficiently appear, that he conſidered the divine *Logos* to be the ſame as the Meſſiah, at leaſt that he no where expreſſly calls him the Meſſiah or ſpeaks of him as ſuch. To this it may be anſwered, that although he does not indeed any where expreſſly call him the Meſſiah; yet it is alſo true, that Philo does no where throughout all his numerous tracts ſtill extant, ſo much as once make any *direct* mention of the Meſſiah, either under a divine or human character: this is certainly a very extraordinary circumſtance, conſidering how important an article it was thought among the Jews, and conſidering alſo how many trifling articles concerning the Jewiſh religion Philo has treated of in a very elaborate philoſophic ſtrain. I can no other way account for this omiſſion, than by ſup-

poſing that he was reſtrained by diſcretion, and through fear of giving offence to the emperors Tiberius and Caligula, to the latter eſpecially, who was incenſed againſt the Jews, for not paying him divine honors as to a Deity; and to whom Philo along with others was ſent ambaſſador to appeaſe his reſentment, yet with little ſucceſs, as is related by Philo himſelf. In ſuch a ſtate of things, not only whoever maketh to himſelf another earthly king ſpeaketh againſt Cæſar, but even who maketh to himſelf any other God: Accordingly we find in the account, which Philo has given of this embaſſy, how very ſuſpicious and jealous Caligula was in this reſpect, concerning the Jews. When Philo attempted to find ſpecious reaſons to pacify him, his anſwer was, "vos ne eſtis illi Judæi diis inviſi, qui me omnium conſenſu Deum declaratum ſoli aſpernamini, mavultiſque *veſtrum Deum innominabilem*, colere (τον ανωνομαστον (θεόν) ὑμιν;)" and at another time he replied, "ſacra feciſtis, ſed *altero Deo*, nec pro me." Caligula however reigned only four years, and died in the year 41: in the beginning of Philo's *Legatio ad Caium* he ſpeaks of himſelf as being then an old man; ſo that moſt of his tracts muſt have been written under Auguſtus and Tiberius, predeceſſors

to

to Caius Caligula. But however cautious Philo might be under ſuch mad tyrants, of *directly* mentioning the expectations of the Jews, concerning the arrival of either an earthly or divine Meſſiah and king; yet we ſhall find, that he has not been wanting to indicate this capital article in a more indirect manner; but ſtill, as I think with ſufficient clearneſs for our preſent purpoſe, namely, to prove, that Philo conſidered the divine *Logos* as being either himſelf the Meſſiah, or that he was to be intimately *united* to, *reſident* or *dwelling* in the human perſon, deſcended from David, who was to figure in the character of the Meſſiah. For according to the popular Jewiſh theology, as ſketched out in Philo, the air was conceived to be inhabited by inviſible, incorporeal, but intelligent beings; who occaſionally *united* themſelves to human bodies, and became the Ψυχαι or ſouls of men.* But they ſuppoſed, that there were other intelligent beings of a more *divine* nature, who became the agents and meſſengers of the Deity; which the heathen philoſophers called genii, or δαιμονες, and the Jews *angeli* or *logoi*, and who aſcended and deſcended,

* "Harum animarum aliæ deſcendunt *illigandæ* corporibus mortalibus." Αι μεν καθιασιν ενδεδησομεναι σωμασι θνητοις. *De Somn.*

as embaſſadors between God and man :* of theſe the *Logos* was the chief, whom he often calls the *moſt antient Logos*, meaning more antient than the creation, as he explains himſelf in lib. 2, Leg. Alleg. and not only this divine *Logos*, but even God himſelf he repreſents alſo as *deſcending* occaſionally, to adminiſter aſſiſtance to men.† Now will any one pretend to maintain, that although Jewiſh theology conſidered all thoſe other intelligent beings before mentioned, as *united to*, or *attached* to human bodies; yet that it conſidered the divine *Logoi* not as united to, but only as adminiſtring aſſiſtance to men *externally*, as we may call it? In the ſentences indeed

* Sunt quædam puriſſimæ optimæ que omnium, quæ altius *diviniuſque* ſapiunt, aſpernatæ iſta terreſtria & humilia, miniſtræ omnipotentis, tamquam magni regis aures & oculi, videntes audienteſque omnia; has genios philoſophi, angelos vocant ſacræ literæ nomine aptiſſimo: ſunt enim internunciæ, patris mandata perferentes ad filios. *De Somn.* 586 Ed. Paris.

† Ουδε γαρ ὁ Θεος, ουδε θειος Λογος ζημιας αιτιος, αλλα Συγκαλα βαινοντες δια φιλανθρωπιαν και ἐλεον τε γενους ἡμων, επικουριας ἑνεκα και συμμαχιας, ἱνα και την ἐλι ὡσπὴρ εν πολαμῳ τῳ Σωματι φορουμενην ψυχην, τα Σωτηρια αναπνεοντες, ανασωσωσι. Nam nec *Deus*, nec *divinus Logos* unquam detrimenti cauſa eſt; ſed una *deſcendunt* per caritatem, & commiſerationem generis noſtri, auxilium propter & ſubſidium, & ut animam, a corpore quaſi a flumine raptam, ſalutem *reſpirantes*, ſervent incolumem.

re-

referred to, nothing but *external* aſſiſtance may perhaps be neceſſarily implied in thoſe words, unleſs αναπνεονλες (reſpirantes) may be thought to indicate, that the divine *Logoi reſided in*, or *united* themſelves *internally* to thoſe men whom they wiſhed to protect. But in other places we ſhall find more ſubſtantial proof, that they, and even the chief divine *Logos* were conſidered by the Jews as affording their protection by actually *reſiding* or *dwelling* in, and being *united to* human bodies. In the following paſſage, for inſtance, the *divine Logoi* are expreſſly ſaid to become οικηλορες, or *inhabitants* of thoſe, out of whom they aſſiſted to drive either *evil deſigns*, or *evil dæmons*:* and are not the goſpels full of relations to the very ſame purport? which confirm, that ſuch Jewiſh theology was not merely a philoſophic invention of Philo, in imitation of Platoniſm; but that it actually was the

* Ταις δε των ελι απολουομενων, μηπω δε καλα το πανλελες εκνιψαμενων—αγγελοι θειοι Λογοι, φαιδρυνονλες αυλας τοις καλοκαγαθιας ομμασιν· ὁσα δε εξοικιζεσθαι κακα, κακ' των οικηλορων, τιφη, ινα εις αγαθα εισοικιζηλαι, δηλον εστι. Eas vero [animas] quæ adhuc lavantur, nondum abſterſis omnibus ſordibus—angeli *divini Logoi*, expurgantes eas oculis honeſtiſſimis, quantæ malorum pellantur turmæ, & *ab his habitantibus* in iis, ut bona ſubſtituantur, manifeſtum eſt. *Ibid.*

cur-

current and popular belief of the Jews in the age of Chriſt. Have not learned men then taken unneceſſary pains in accounting various ways for the relations in the Goſpels concerning *Dæmones*, when the whole of this popular theology is rendered ſo very intelligible and obvious in the writings of Philo?* But it is not merely *divine Logoi* or angels in general, which are thus repreſented in Philo, as being often actual *inhabitants* in the bodies of men: for in like manner the chief or *moſt antient Logos* (as Philo expreſſes himſelf,) is likewiſe ſometimes mentioned by him, as being actually *reſident in* the high-prieſt of the Jews, and even as being the *very ſame* perſon with the high-prieſt, as if they were blended into a *compound* individual; in conſequence of which, the high-prieſt is there ſpoken of,

* The buſineſs of revelation was to teach men the divine attributes, moral truths, and the future judgments of God, not to rectify every popular error. Therefore as in the Old Teſtament, the ſacred writers ſpeak of the ſun as moving or ſtanding ſtill, and as going round the earth, with other errors in philoſophy, to render themſelves underſtood by the people: juſt ſo in the New Teſtament it was not the buſineſs of the authors to explain the cauſes of diſeaſes, whether by Dæmons or natural cauſes; and the miracles of Chriſt in curing thoſe diſorders, were not the leſs ſo, becauſe the populace attributed them to a wrong cauſe.

and

and declared to be no longer *a man*. "Hæc eſt igitur noſtra ſententia, pontificem *non hominem* ſed *Logon divinum* eſſe, quod expers eſt peccatorum omnium, non ſolum ſpontaneorum, verum etiam involuntariorum:"* and of this *divine Logos* he ſays alſo that he *dwells* in God, "Ille [*Logos*] qui tantum abeſt ut ſponte delinquat, ut ne imprudens quidem id faciat, ipſum *Deum ſortem habens* [Θεον κληρον εκων] in eo ſolo *habitabit* (κατοικησει). He goes on to deſcribe this *divine Logos* thus *united to* the high-prieſt, as having had God for his father, and as being *anointed* with oil at his generation or firſt government. "Patrem habet Deum, qui omnium rerum pater eſt, matrem vero ſapientiam, per quam omnia producta ſunt; quamobrem caput ejus *ungitur oleo*."† Hence we find, that *unction* was conſidered by the popular theology, to be as proper a mark of diſtinction for the *divine Logos*, as for any worldly king; ſo that when Trypho approves of that tenet of the Chriſtian Sectaries, whereby they ſup-

* Λεγομεν γαρ, τον αρχιερεα ουκ ανθρωπον, αλλ Λογον Θειον ειναι, παντων ουκ εκουσιων μονον, αλλα και ακουσιων αμεπτον. *De Profugis*, 466.

† Πατηρ μεν Θεου, ὁς και των Συμπαντων εστι Πατηρ· Μητηρ δε Σοφιας, δι ἡς τα ὁλα ηλθεν εις γενεσιν· και διοτι την κεφαλην κεχρισται ἐλαιω. *ibid.*

poſed

poſed the *human* Jeſus to be *anointed* Chriſt, it cannot be concluded from this expreſſion, that an earthly and human king only was in Trypho's mind; he might juſt as well mean the *unction* of the *divine Logos*, or Chriſt at his deſcent and *union* with the human Jeſus, in order to diſcharge the office of Meſſiah; which was, as it were, a new generation or government: nay indeed, I cannot perceive what other idea can be included under the act of being anointed Chriſt, than ſuch an union of Divinity with humanity, in the perſon of the Meſſiah; for Trypho could not ſuppoſe that Jeſus was conſtituted a worldly king.* Philo goes on to ſay, "that ſo long as this *divine Logos* ſhall *live* in and be *adherent* to the ſoul [of the high-prieſt] it is not poſſible, that any involuntary change can take place in it——

* To this popular opinion concerning the *unction* of the *divine Logos*, when he commenced his Meſſiahſhip, St. Paul alludes, when he quotes from the Pſalms and applies to the Meſſiah theſe words. "Thy God hath *anointed* thee with the oil of gladneſs above thy fellows." *Hebr.* 1. 9. In general St. Paul's epiſtles, that to the Hebrews eſpecially, contain an excellent commentary upon the popular theology of the Jews in Philo, ſufficiently confirming the genuineneſs of it, and that it was no way conformed by him to the doctrines of Plato, but that Philo gave it to us as he found it. Hence ſome critics have thought, that Philo *chriſtianized*; they might more juſtly have ſaid, that St. Paul *hebraized*.

but

but when he, [the high-prieſt] ſhall die, the *divine Logos* being, not indeed then extinct, but *ſeparated* (διαζευχθεις) from the ſoul of us men, a way is opened for involuntary tranſgreſſions." *Ibid.* Theſe expreſſions prove ſufficiently, that ſuch phraſes as *reſiding* or *dwelling* in a human body, meant as intimate a connection with the ſoul of man, as we either can conceive or expreſs by the phraſe of being *united to* it, ſo as to form a *compound* individual. Since then Philo here ranked the high-prieſt as being the ſame with the *divine Logos*, and in other places calls the *divine Logos* a high-prieſt, and conceives them capable of forming a compound individual;* it is plain, that the popular theology had no objection to a ſimilar compound, formed out of the *divine Logos* and a *human* Meſſiah deſcended from David: which *union* they would naturally ſignify under the idea of the latter being *anointed Chriſt*; who would conſequently, be then no longer conſidered as *mere man*. Accordingly, we actually find one paſſage at leaſt in Philo, wherein he clearly indicates, although he may not *directly* affirm,

* We find St. Paul often alluding alſo to this popular theology, with reſpect to the *divine Logos* being the ſame as the high-prieſt. Λογος εστι αρχιερευς ὁς καθαιρει την ψυχην ἁρμαρτημαἰων. Philo. de Somn.

that the ſame *divine Logos*, who was thus united to the high-prieſt, was alſo expected to appear afterwards as the Meſſiah, or to *reſide in*, and be *united to* the human Meſſiah. Previouſly to the paſſage alluded to, Philo had been pointing out, that it was this *moſt antient divine Logos* (as he calls him) who had been actually the *chief agent* or aſſiſtant to the Jews, in two or three events recorded in the Old Teſtament. As for inſtance, in ſending, and equally diſtributing manna among the Iſraelites in the wilderneſs, "cœleſtem illum cibum animæ, qui manna vocatur, omnibus utentibus *divinus Logos* ex æquo diſtribuit."* Again, in ſeparating the obedient from the diſobedient, leſt the one ſhould be deſtroyed by God's judgements along with the other, "miror etiam, quod ſacer *Logos* magna celeritate & perſeverantia intercurrit in *medio* inter mortuos & vivos; "mox enim (dixit Moſes) ceſſavit attritio" non ceſſatura profecto—— niſi *amicus Deo* diremiſſet ſanctos, qui vere vivunt, a profanis qui mortui ſunt ſecundum veritatem."† Again, "ſed magis miror

* Την ουρανιον τροφην ψυχης, ἣν καλει μαννα, διανεμει πασι τοις χρησομενοις θειος Λογος εξ ισου. *Quis divin. rer. Hær.* 507.

† Θαυμαζω και τον μετα σπουδης απνευσι δραμοντα συντονως ἱερον Λογον, ἱνα στη μεσος των τεθνηκοτων και των ζωντων· Ἐυθυς

miror, dum è ſacris eloquiis diſco, quo modo nubes interjecit ſe *mediam* inter Ægyptiacas & Iſraeliticas copias: nam hæc nubes, ceu ſcuto, protegens & conſervans Deo charum populum temperantiæ deditum, non ſinebat exagitari, arcendo impiam gentem ſervientem affectibus"——Cæterum *illi archangelo & antiquiſſimo Logo* hoc eximium donum conceſſit pater omnium creator, ut *medius terminus* ſtans, facta diſcerneret a factore: Idem *ſupplex* immortalem appellat pro mortalibus deprecans, & a ſummo rege *legatus* exiſtens ad ſubditos: Hoc donum tam libenter accipit, ut jactet etiam, dicens " & ego ſteteram *medius* inter vos & Dominum" (videlicet nec ingenitus ut Deus, nec genitus ut nos ſed inter extrema medius, apud utroſque obſidem agens; apud creatorem, ut fidem ei faciat nunquam corruptum iri & defecturum totum genus humanum, perturbationem ordini præferens; apud creaturam verò, ut bonam ei ſpem præbeat, nunquam benignum Deum neglecturum opus ſuum) " ego enim *Præconis munere fungar de pace apud creaturam* ab

Ἐυθυς γαρ, φησι Μωσης, εκοπασεν ἡ θραυσις· αλλα ουκ εμελλε κοπασαι—μη διαλειχησανλος του θεοφιλους τους ὁσιους, ὁι ζωσιν αψευδως απο τῶν αγοσιων, ὁι τεθνηκασι καὶ αληθειαν λογῖσμου. *ibid.*

eo Deo, qui bella ſtudet tollere, pacis cuſtode perpetuo."* Now as at the words *& ego ſteteram medius*, &c. the *Logos* refers to, and quotes a ſentence as ſpoken by Moſes in the Septuagint (*Deut.* v. 5.) ſo after a parentheſis, in which Philo elaborately deſcribes in his own words, the nature and office of the *Logos*, he repreſents the *Logos* as reſuming his ſpeech in a ſtrain ſuitable to the *laſt* ſentence of Philo's parentheſis: it hence becomes the more probable, that in theſe concluding words of the *Logos*, *ego enim præconis munere fungar*, &c. he intended again to refer to ſome other paſſages in the Old Teſtament, namely, to the predictions of Iſaiah and others, that the Meſſiah ſhould be the *prince of peace*; and the *Logos* plainly here declares, that he himſelf ſhould be that very *Herald of Peace*, who *ſhould afterwards* appear to fulfil the aforeſaid predictions, i. e. the Meſſiah.

* —Τω δε αρχαγγελω και πρεσβυτατω λογω εξαιρετον εδωκεν δωρεαν ὁ τα ὁλα γεννησας πατηρ, ινα μεθοριος τας, το γενομενον διακρινῃ του πεποιηκοτος· ὁ δε αυτος ικετης μεν εστι του θνητου κηραινοντος αει προς το αφθαρτον, πρεσβευτης δε του ἡγεμονος προς το υπηκοον· αγαλλεται δε επι τῃ δωρεᾳ και ζεμνυνομενος αυτην εκδημειται, φασκων. "Καγω εστηκειν αμα μεσον κυριου και ὑμων" (ουτε αγγεννητος ως ὁ θεος ων, ουτε γεννητος, &c. for which ſee note *p.* 39.) Εγω γαρ επικηρυκευσομαι τα ειρηναια γενεσει παρα του καθαιρειν πολεμους εγνωκοτος ειρηνοφυλακος αει θεου." Quis rer. divin. hær. p. 509.

It

Itſeems impoſſible for any impartial man, who ſhall attend to the connexion and tendency of this paſſage in Philo, not to allow, that herein he clearly ſets forth the ſame *divine Logos*, who *had been* the *agent* along with Moſes in the Old Teſtament, as declaring that he *ſhould be* the *agent* likewiſe in the ſubſequent diſpenſations of God to the Iſraelites, particularly in being the herald and meſſenger of peace to them, agreeably to the *good hope* Philo teaches them to conceive from the *benignity* of the ſupreme *Creator* towards his *creatures*. So that altho' Philo does not here *directly* name the Meſſiah, yet he ſo clearly, though *indirectly* both deſcribes him and attributes *divinity* to him, that it ſeems to be a deciſive explanation of the meaning of Jonathan by the word *Deus*: upon the whole then this paſſage may be conſidered as a more explicite commentary on thoſe phraſes in Iſaiah, "The mighty God, the prince of peace;"*

* As Philo quotes verbatim from the Septuag. thoſe words καγω εστηκειν, &c. ſo in the latter paſſage Εγω γαρ επικηρυκευσομαι τα ειρηναια γενεσει, though he varies a little from the Septuagint, yet he preſerves enough of it to prove, that it was imitated from theſe words of Iſaiah in the Alexand. MS. Εγω γαρ αξω ειρηνην επι τους αρχοντας. Both αξω and επικηρυκευσομαι properly imply *agency* and not *prophetic ſpeech*. (Iſaiah 9. 6.)

and

and as in the *firſt* examples the *Logos* is uniformly conſidered by Philo as *an agent* concerning the events there related, it muſt be Philo's intention to repreſent the *Logos* as an *agent* or *herald* in the *laſt* example, and not as a mere *predictor* of peace to be brought about by ſome other perſon. This ſenſe is corroborated ſtill farther by the opinion entertained by Juſtin, Tertullian, and all the oldeſt Chriſtians; who every where repreſent the ſame divine perſon, the Son of God, who appeared as Chriſt, as having been alſo the very perſon, who was the *agent* in all the divine operations in the Old Teſtament; who appeared in the buſh, or as an angel, and was the guardian of the Iſraelites throughout: an opinion, which ſome of the humaniſts (I think) ſomewhere wonder, how the firſt Chriſtians came to take up: but which, we ſee, is eaſily acounted for, it being, like many other of their opinions, derived immediately from the theology of the Jews themſelves. Whether then we ſay, that Philo and the Jews conſidered this *divine Logos* as being the *very ſame* with the Meſſiah, or as having become *united to*, *reſident* or *dwelling* in the human Meſſiah, deſcended of David, from the time of his *unction* and *election*, juſt as in the caſe of the high-prieſt; either way, Philo and the Jews attributed ſome degree of *Divinity* to the

the compound, and did not conſider him as being *mere man*: this is as clearly expreſſed, as could be expected from ſuch a myſtical writer as Philo, and one whoſe tongue was tied by diſcretion, and the fear of ſpeaking too clearly in plain Greek, however diſpoſed he may have been to perſpicuity in his own Hebrew, in caſe he underſtood it, which is indeed doubted. But whatever the judgment of the public may be concerning this paſſage and the view, which I have preſented of the ſtate of Jewiſh theology in the age of Chriſt, yet what muſt it think of the accuracy of Dr. P. who undertaking to write a *hiſtory* of the corruptions of Chriſtianity, has nevertheleſs omitted the whole of this popular polytheiſm of the Jews, current at that time; notwithſtanding that it was in fact ſo much the grand magazine and original fountain head of all the ſyſtems of the firſt Chriſtian Sectaries, that it may with propriety be ſtiled the *Officina Hæreſium*; Ben Mordecai perhaps would add, *immo etiam orthodoxiæ*; but the former fact we ſhall find more and more confirmed as we proceed: and yet in direct contradiction to all this evidence from Jewiſh authors themſelves, Dr. P. has peremptorily affirmed, that "no Jew had originally *any idea* of their Meſſiah being *more than man*;" and has hence

hence derived an argument for the probability, that the Apoſtles and firſt Chriſtians *muſt have* held the mere humanity of Chriſt, becauſe the Jews did ſo before them. But if by *originally* he meant *many ages* before Chriſt, the ſuppoſed fact is both uncertain, and alſo foreign to the purpoſe; for if it was ever ſo true, it cannot remove theſe teſtimonies to the belief of the Jews in the *divinity* of their Meſſiah, when Chriſtianity made its appearance: all of which teſtimonies were cotemporary with that very age, ſuch as thoſe from Philo, from the book of the *Wiſdom of Solomon* †, from the demonic ſyſtem in the goſpels, from St. Paul's epiſtles, Jonathan's paraphraſe, the tenets of the Gnoſtics, and other firſt

† That the book called the *Wiſdom of Solomon* was compoſed before Chriſt appears from the many alluſions and references made to particular paſſages in it by the apoſtles. Now the divine *Logos* is often repreſented in this book after the ſame manner as by Philo, as for inſtance, Ὁ παντοδυναμος σε Λογος απ' ουρανων εκ θρονων βασιλειων αποταμος Πολεμιστης εις μεσον της ολεθριας ἠλατο γης. Omnipotens Logos tuus a cœlis ex thronis regalibus aſper Bellator in medium terræ exitio deſtinatæ deſiliit, cap. 18. 15. This is ſpoken of the angel, who ſtruck the firſt born in Egypt; and it proves, that ſuch polytheiſtic modes of ſtyle were not peculiar to Philo: the frequent references alſo to this book by the apoſtles, prove it to have been as familiar among the Jews in that age, as the Bible in ours.

chriſtian

Chriſtian Heretics;* thoſe all agree in confirming the actual currency among the Jews, of ſome parts or other of ſuch a polytheiſtic theology, as Philo had deſcribed.

Since

* If the fathers had not been ſo very brief and imperfect in their accounts of the tenets of the firſt Sectaries, we ſhould probably have had more numerous proofs how cloſely theſe copied from the current theology of the Jews: yet even ſtill, brief as they are, they have occaſionally dropped ſufficient information to prove, that thoſe Sectaries derived more of their tenets from the popular ſemi-heathen theology of the Jews, than from Platoniſm, or any other heathen philoſophy; evidence of which, I ſhall notice in our progreſs as it occurs. At preſent, for inſtance, I may obſerve, that as the Jewiſh theology attributed *unction* to the divine *Logos* at the commencement of his office (ſee p. 47.) ſo the firſt Sectaries did the ſame in regard to Jeſus at his *election* and baptiſm as Chriſt, as appears from the words of Trypho in Juſtin (p. 37.) What ſects Trypho had in view we are ignorant, but it was probably the Ebionites, Nazarenes, &c. Epiphanius has happened to omit this circumſtance, when treating of thoſe ſects; but under the ſect of Melchiſedechians, he has noticed the *unction* as well as *election* of Jeſus, which by the account of Trypho was probably general among thoſe Sectaries [υπο θεου κεχρισμενος και εκλεκτος γενομενος ὁ Χριστος. *Hær.* 55.] What idea was included under *unction* from God, by thoſe Sectaries, we are ignorant likewiſe; but as they probably here again followed the Jewiſh theology, we find from Philo, that it was conſidered as a mark of the communication of Divinity; for immediately after ſaying, that the *Logos* was *anointed* by God, he adds by way of explana-

Since writing the above, I find that the objection, which I have ſtarted and removed in the preceding paragraph, has been actually thus inſiſted on, in the *Theolog. Repoſit.* publiſhed under the inſpection of Dr. Prieſtley. "Philo made a much more ſubſtantial perſonification of the divine *Logos*, than any of the proper Platoniſts had done;

tion, that a Glory ſurrounded him, the common ſymbol of Divinity "λεγω δε, το ἡγεμονικον (αυλὴ) φωτὶ αυγοειδει περιλαμπεῖαι principatus, inquam, ejus ſplendido circumfulget lumine." This forms ſome preſumption, that all thoſe other ſects whom Dr. P. calls antient unitarians conceived Divinity to be communicated to Jeſus at baptiſm, as well as the Ebionites. For the Melchiſedechians were apparently deſcendants from them, being eſtabliſhed by the ſecond Theodotus, a diſciple of the firſt Theodotus, who *firſt* introduced and taught the principles of the Ebionites, among the Greek and Gentile Chriſtians, as Euſebius and others relate. That ſuch *unction* from God, or communication of Divinity was ever reſtrained to the mere ſpirit of prophetic *inſpiration* without including alſo a power of doing all other works of Divinity, ſuch as miracles, &c. is neither countenanced by Philo's Jewiſh Theology, nor by the Old Teſtament or the New, ſee Luke iv. 18. *Acts* x. 38. A perſon ſo *anointed* was conſidered as *filled* with the fullneſs of the Godhead, which became *united to* or *reſident in* him: to make any diſtinction in ſuch modes of expreſſion is a diſtinction without a difference. The modern Rabbins alſo underſtand *oil of unction* from God in the ſame ſenſe; *vid. R. Bechai Comment. in Pentat. ap. Buxterfium in Lexic. Talmudic. col.* 2397.

as

as he repreſented the divine *Logos* as being the immediate *Agent* in all the communications of God to the Patriarchs, they (the Chriſtian fathers) had nothing to do beſides making this *Logos* to be the ſame with Chriſt, and their ſcheme was very nearly completed. But Philo himſelf *was far from imagining, that the Logos* had any *more relation to the Meſſiah*, than to any other prophet: according to him it was the medium of divine communications *with the prophets*, but was never ſuppoſed to *reſide* with any of them, and much leſs to be inſeparably *attached to* them, or to *animate* them," *Vol.* 4. *No.* 5. *p.* 417, *of the Platoniſm of Philo.* I am ſorry to ſee, that theſe writers pay ſo little regard to truth, in the many random aſſertions they make: for in fact, no one inſtance can be produced in Philo, wherein he ſuppoſes the *Logos* to have been the medium of communication to any of *the prophets*; and if any ſingle inſtance could be produced, yet it muſt appear as an extraordinary caſe, ſince the general, if not univerſal mode of information to the prophets, was according to Philo by means of *dreams*, *viſions* and *ecſtaſies*, without any intervention of the *Logos*, as for example in the ſubjoined

note* This misrepresentation was probably made in order to favor their supposition, that Christ was to be considered only as an *inspired prophet*. But Philo does indeed represent the divine *Logos* as the medium of communication in many of the *miraculous*, and other *events* concerning the Patriarchs and Moses also, but it is concerning Moses as a *Leader* of the people under God, and

* Occidente sole exstasis (εκστασις) irruit super Abraham: exstasis alia est faciens delirum——alia quando mens otiatur——sed optima alia, quando furore divino corripitur, qualis est prophetici generis [ἡ το προφητικον γενος χρηται]——Exstasis incubuit in Abraham, correptum numine aflatumque divino spiritu; quibus verbis ostenditur eum prophetam etiam fuisse—omnibus probis viris sacra Scriptura prophetiam tribuit; nam propheta nihil ex se proloquitur, sed omnia submonente alio [ὑπηχουντος ἑτερου] —— quandoquidem solus est instrumentum Dei resonans [οργανον θεου ηχουν] ab eo contactum & pulsatum invisibiliter—Quid Moses, nonne ubique propheta celebratur? Scribitur enim "si fuerit vobis propheta Domini, *per visionem* ei me manifestabo" [εν οραματι αυτω γνωσθησομαι] Mosi autem ore ad os loquor, nullus propheta qualis Moses exortus est, quem allocutus est Dominus facie ad faciem, & merito, nemper aflatum suo numine [ενθουσιωντα]" *Quis rer. divin. hær. p.* 515. Whom Philo meant by ἑτερου, and that it was not the *Logos*, but God himself, appears by another passage, "Propheta interpres est Dei dictantis intus oracula [ὑπηχουντος τα λεκτεα τε θεου]" *De præm.* 918. This cool account of prophecy, confirms what was mentioned in the preceding note; that *unction* from God, must have implied some superior communication of divine power.

not

not as a *prophet*; as I have myſelf ſhewn above: that Philo moreover conſidered the *Logos* as having *no relation* to the Meſſiah, is, as I have alſo ſhewn, another miſrepreſentation; there not being a ſingle ſyllable concerning the Meſſiah to be found in all Philo's works; how then can any one affirm what Philo *imagined* concerning a ſubject, which he has never once mentioned? are theſe the writers, who profeſs themſelves ſincere enquirers after truth, and yet thus miſlead their readers at almoſt every ſtep, by making aſſertions for which they have not the leaſt foundation, except in *their own imaginations*. Another writer goes farther and affirms, "that though Philo ſays a great deal concerning the *Logos* —he never *hints*, that the *Logos* was to be the Meſſiah, or the *ſoul* of the Meſſiah, or had any particular relation to him——ſo that I cannot admit, that any Jew ever ſuppoſed, that their Meſſiah had pre-exiſted, or was properly ſpeaking God." *Vol.* 4. *No.* 5. *p.* 481. In contradiction to this, I have proved, from Philo's deſcription of the *Logos* under the character and office of the Meſſiah, from his referring to the *Logos* the accompliſhment of an eminent prophecy, which was univerſally conſidered as predictive of the Meſſiah, and from analogy in his

his reaſoning and narration, that Philo has given as ſtrong *hints* of his *imagining* the *Logos* to be the ſame as the Meſſiah, as can be conceived concerning any thing, which falls ſhort of a direct aſſertion in plain words. But as to Philo's ſuppoſing the *Logos* to be the *ſoul* of the Meſſiah, this would have been inconſiſtent with the whole ſyſtem of Jewiſh theology; it appears by the paſſages which I have quoted, that they never conſidered the *Logos* otherwiſe, than as intimately connected with the *ſoul* of man, and *dwelling* in him: it was only the moſt inferior order of incorporeal ſpirits, which became the *ſouls* of men, and which ſtrictly ſpeaking *animated* them. Upon the whole, the humaniſts do not ſeem as yet to have reduced their opinions to any fixed and coherent ſyſtem: for if they meant by the above, and by another paſſage of Dr. Prieſtley,* that Philo *only* and *firſt* of all the Jews adopted Platoniſm, this requires ſome better proof, than ſuch brief aſſertions as "I can not admit

* "Perſonification, that is, *the making a real intelligent perſon* of the *Logos*, or wiſdom of God, was moſt indiſputably the real doctrine both of Philo, the platonizing Jew, and of thoſe who were called orthodox Chriſtians, who Platonized likewiſe." *Lett. to Dr. H. part* 2, *p.* 124.

this

this or that."* But if they meant to aſſert no more, than that Philo Platonized along with, and in imitation of his Jewiſh predeceſſors, this may indeed be true; and I have already refered to ſuch *antient* evidence, as the ravages of time have ſpared, in proof that ſuch a polytheiſtic ſyſtem as that of Philo exiſted among the Jews long before: but whether it was derived from Platoniſm or oriental philoſophy, I do not pretend to determine; poſſibly in part from both, for that it was not ſolely drawn from Plato, appears from ſeveral circumſtances in this Jewiſh ſyſtem, which were inconſiſtent with Platoniſm. Let us now proceed to ſome more *modern* evidence, concerning the currency and antiquity of this popular theology among the Jews.

A writer in the *Commentaries by a ſociety for promoting chriſtian knowledge*, ſays, "If the words in Iſaiah ix. 6. ought to be underſtood concerning the Meſſiah, and alſo be rightly rendered, "the mighty God," is it not aſtoniſhing, that both *antient* and *modern* Jews, as the truth is, ſhould have expected only a *man* for their Meſſiah?" *No.* 3. 248.

* Or again "the Meſſiah, ſuch as the Jews expected (was) a man and a king." Here we may obſerve, that the dubious word *originally* is not introduced. *Lett. to Dr. H. part* 1, *p.* 55.

He

He rightly ſays, that it would be aſtoniſhing, if thoſe words had not led the Jews to attribute divinity to the Meſſiah: but the fact, which he ſubjoins is not true; for I have ſhewn, that thoſe words did actualy lead the *antient* Jews to aſcribe Divinity to the Meſſiah; and it may be equally proved alſo, that the *modern* Rabbins have adhered to the ſame opinion. All that is true in that aſſertion is, that the Jews never did believe that the Meſſiah was to be *born* divine, and this is alſo all that the antient Chriſtians do really aſſert, concerning the diſbelief of the Jews in the divinity of the Meſſiah: this opinion ſtood greatly in the way of the antient orthodox Chriſtians, who believed Divinity to have been united with Jeſus from his very conception; and it becomes a proof of the antiquity and originality of that orthodox tenet among the firſt Chriſtians. But that Divinity was not to be united to the human Meſſiah iſſuing from David, at any time after his birth, is what the Jews never aſſerted; and in this alone conſiſted the chief difference between the antient Jews and Chriſtians, with reſpect to the Divinity of the Meſſiah; in which moſt of the Sectaries ſided with the Jews. This is what Trypho excepts againſt in Juſtin; he allows that Jeſus was *anointed* afterwards,

wards, that is, as I conceive with Divinity;* but through want of obſervation concerning this chief ſource of difference between the Jews and Chriſtians, the humaniſts have introduced much confuſion into the ſubject. The heathens had not the ſame objection to a perſon being *born* with Divinity; the degree of Divinity however, was another cauſe of diſſenſion; and every polytheiſtic ſyſtem, which ever exiſted, always admitted different degrees of Divinity, that of the Jews not excepted. For their popular theology was in reality Polytheiſm, notwithſtanding that they conſidered themſelves as maintaining the *unity*; which is no uncommon caſe; for do not the Romaniſts alſo maintain the ſame, altho' the proteſtants accuſe them of polytheiſm? and do not the humaniſts make the very

* As the paſſage quoted above from Philo at p. 60 ſhews, that the antient Jews conſidered *prophecy* to be ſuch a common and ordinary acquiſition, that nothing more than an *exſtacy* was required to obtain it: ſo that unction from God was ſome more extraordinary gift, and never reſtrained to a mere communication of a ſpirit of prophecy, is proved by the two paſſages of the New Teſtament referred to in a note at p. 58; for there is not a word about prophecy mentioned there among the effects of the *unction* of Jeſus; and in the paſſage of Iſaiah to which Luke refers, the commentators agree, that Iſaiah ſpeaks in the *perſon* of the Meſſiah. *Iſ.* 61. 1.

ſame accuſation againſt the orthodox of all Chriſtian ſects, who as conſtantly deny the fact? Let not proteſtants, whether they be humaniſts or otherwiſe, be inconſiſtent with themſelves, and hold a double face; by reaſoning one way, when an accuſation affects others, and a contrary way, when the ſame accuſation affects themſelves or their own opinions and arguments: if the proteſtants can be right in accuſing the papiſts with polytheiſm, and the humaniſts be right in making the ſame accuſation againſt the orthodox, notwithſtanding they both affirm, that they maintain the unity of God; then by the very ſame rule the Jews might alſo in fact have been polytheiſts, although they in like manner aſſert in their writings, that they believe in the unity. Let us ſee then what the modern Rabbins ſay concerning this divinity of the Meſſiah: their opinions have been collected at large from their writings by various authors; but I ſhall content myſelf with quoting a few paſſages from Whitby. I prefer Whitby's authority, not on account of his greater judgment or accuracy, but only becauſe the humaniſts ſeem to pay a deference to his opinions and aſſertions, though perhaps for no better reaſon, than becauſe they did not conceive him to be perfectly orthodox; which is therefore an additional motive

tive for quoting his words, as he cannot be ſuppoſed to be biaſed by orthodoxy in what he has here collected from the writings of the Rabbins. "It was the opinion of *the Jews*---that the Meſſiah being *created before the world*, God entered into covenant with him, that he ſhould redeem the world, and the Jews eſpecially; "*God* (ſay they) *began to covenant with the Meſſiah, when he created him and ſaid, the ſins of thoſe, who are laid up in ſecret with thee, will make thee to come under an iron yoke*——*wilt thou undergo their condition for them? the Meſſiah ſaid, I undertake it with joy*:*——and again, *when God created the world, he held forth his hand and created the ſoul of the Meſſiah and his company*, &c." *Annot. Epiſt. Epheſ.* i. 4. Hence we learn, that *pre-exiſtence* before the creation was actually attributed to the Meſſiah by the *Jews in general*, and not by Philo only; they could not then at worſt conſider him as being *mere man* from David: neither could ſuch opinions as theſe have been innovations firſt introduced by the Rabbins, long

* It is obſervable how ſimilar this ſentence is to the words aſcribed by Philo to the *Logos* at p. 51, Hoc donum tam libenter accipit, ut jactet etiam dicens, &c. Αγγαλλείαι δε επι τη δωρεᾳ.

after chriſtianity; their antipathy to the Chriſtians would have prevented all imitation in doctrine; theſe muſt have been traditionary tenets, tranſmitted from the antient Jewiſh theology, and retained by the later Rabbins, as relics of old eſtabliſhed doctrines, formerly current among the Jews. Whitby alſo ſays "the like notions (with Philo) *the Jews* ſeem to have had concerning their *Logos*, as appears in the book of *Wiſdom*, &c." *Annot. Epiſt. Hebr.* i. 3. He therefore plainly allowed, that the *whole body of Jews* had Platonized, and this in more antient times than Philo, in caſe their theology was indeed derived from Plato at all. The current opinions of the antient Chriſtians, and even of the heathens confirm the ſame fact, as thoſe of the Rabbins. Jerom ſays in one place concerning Philo, that he was *ſermonis Platonici imitator*;* in another, *Philonem alterum judæum Platonem critici pronunciant*;† in a third, *Vulgo apud Græcos dicitur, aut Plato Philonizat aut Philo Platonizat; tanta eſt ſimilitudo ſenſuum & eloquii.*‡ Now this laſt paſſage explains the two former ones, and proves, that neither

* De Virgin. Servand.
† Epiſt. ad Magnum.
‡ Catalog. Scriptor.

Jerom

Jerom nor the other Chriſtians ever meant to inſinuate by the two firſt paſſages, that Philo *only* among the Jews was guilty of platonizing; for what could the heathen Greeks mean (*apud Græcos* muſt refer to the heathens) by ſuggeſting, whether Plato might not imitate Philo, when the former preceded the latter 400 years? they could only mean to queſtion, whether Plato did not borrow from the ſame ſource of Jewiſh theology, which Philo afterwards explained at large in Greek: now whether this fact was true or not, yet the very doubt contains a proof that ſuch a theology was in thoſe days ſuppoſed to have exiſted among the Jews, and this even before Plato himſelf. Accordingly the antient Chriſtians agree in ſuppoſing, that Plato, when in Egypt, became acquainted there with the Jewiſh ſcriptures, and the current Jewiſh doctrines of that age: one ſhould think, that heathens and Chriſtians could not have thus agreed in a fact, for which there could have been no foundation, if Philo had been the firſt, who had introduced from Plato that theology diſplayed in his own works. Euſebius in like manner expreſſly affirms, that *the Jews in general* held the ſame doctrine with Philo---"*The Jews* teach, that after the eſſence of God, king of all, which is without beginning and unbegotten

gotten, there is a principle begotten of no other but the Father——called the *word* of God, &c."* If we come down to later Chriſtian writers, we find both orthodox and heterodox authors all affirming the currency of Philo's theology among the Jews, and even ſome of the humaniſts themſelves. Selden ſays " that by the Son of God *the Jews* meant the *word* of God (as he is called in the Chaldee Paraphraſe) which was all one, as to profeſs himſelf God."† Dr. Pocock, who was well acquainted with the rabbinical authors ſays, " that according to the ſenſe of *the antient Jews*, the Son of God ſpoken of in Pſal. ii. was the eternal Son of God, of the ſame ſubſtance with the Father," and this he aſſerts in his notes on a Jewiſh writer, wherein he could not but learn, whether it was conſiſtent or not with the doctrine of the Rabbins, i. e. *in not. Miſcell. ad Maimonidem, p.* 307. I ſhall but juſt refer to Biſhop Bull, becauſe he may be conſidered as a prejudiced author :‡ but

* Præparat. Evangel, lib. 7. c. 15. Παρ Εβραιους, &c.

† De Iure Nat. & Gent. l. 2. c. 12.

‡ " Ne quis autem in his de *Logo Philonem Platonizein* ſuſpicetur (quod multi Judaicæ literaturæ imperiti opinati ſunt) cum potius exiſtimandum Platonem *philonizein*, hoc eſt ſua de *Logo* ex Judæorum diſciplinâ, quæ Philoni ut ita dicam vernacula fuit, hauſiſſe." *Defens. Fid. Nic. c.* 1. *ſect.* 1. *paragr.* 18.

the

the ſame accuſation cannot be made againſt Le Clerc, who nevertheleſs juſt as ſtrenuouſly maintains, that the theology of Philo had exiſted among the Jews long before the age of that author.* By the *writers* and *Hæretics* referred to here by Le Clerc, he could only mean *Jewiſh writers*, and *Hæreties* among the Jews themſelves, becauſe he adds, that they introduced Platonic phraſes into the *Jewiſh religion*; he ſpeaks of Philo as being only a *later* aſſiſtant in the ſame practice; but what he ſays of *more antient* writers among the Jews, is indeed all conjecture of his own to account for the fact, which he acknowledges concerning the exiſtence of ſuch phraſes in the Jewiſh religion before the time of Philo: we have little or no knowledge either of the *writers*, or of the *tenets* of the hæretical ſects among the Jews. But that Le Clerc did not mean *phraſes* only without *opinions* appears from what he ſays in another of

* "*Scriptores* celebres & ſectæ *Hæreticorum* in *religionem Judaicam* & Chriſtianam intuliſſent plures voces Platonicas——Exſtant quoque celeberrimi Philonis varia ſcripta, apoſtolis æqualis, & iis, ſi nonnullis veterum credamus familiaris, ubi eædem voces tam ſæpe adhibentur, ut non minus ad eum, quam ad *memoratos hæreticos* reſpexiſſe Johannem crediderem in capite 1mo." *Annot. cap. 1. Johann. p.* 396.

his

his tracts, "The *Jews* were of theſe *opinions* (concerning the *Logos*) when our Savior and his apoſtles came into the world: and this is perhaps the reaſon, why we find ſeveral platonic *phraſes* in the New Teſtament, eſpecially in the goſpel of St. John."* Another point, in which Philo reſembles Plato, namely, the doctrine of Dæmoniſm, Le Clerc elſewhere allows to have been as antient among *the Jews* as their return from captivity, and to have been borrowed by them from the Chaldæans:† and ſo might all the reſt of Philo's Jewiſh theology, for Plutarch mentions Λογοι as a common name among the heathens for ſubordinate Divinities; ſo that Philo's theology reſembled Plato, only becauſe Plato and the Jews had both of them copied after the ſame heathen originals both Greek and Oriental; and this Le Clerc alſo hints as his own opinion by *inter alia*. Inſtead then of ſaying, that Philo *Platonized*, it would perhaps be more juſt to ſay, that the Jews had all along *Chaldaized* ſince their captivity. If more-

* Life of Euſebius by Le Clerc, p. 82. Engl. Tranſl. 1696.

† Doctrinam de Dæmonibus *inter alia* a Chaldæis videntur accepiſſe Judæi; unde poſt reditum a captivitate tam frequens eorum mentio, quæ antea aut tenuis aut nulla prorſus occurrit." *Clerici. præf. ad hiſtor. oriental. Stanlei.* 1690.

over

over what many learned men now maintain be true, namely, that *Gnoſticiſm* had exiſted among the Jews themſelves, *before* it was introduced into Chriſtianity;* this will ſupply another confirmation of the currency of a Polytheiſtic theology among the Jews. For the leading tenet of Gnoſticiſm was, that it was not the ſupreme Deity himſelf, who was either the maker of the world, or the God of the Jews; but a ſubordinate Divinity of an evil principle, and that the *Logos*, a ſubordinate and good Divinity came to remove the ill effects of the former's conduct: this ſyſtem is wholly founded in Polytheiſm, and was probably introduced among the Jews by ſome of their own Sectaries. If accounts had been preſerved of the chief tenets of thoſe Jewiſh Sectaries, we ſhould have been better able to judge of this matter; but as it is, we find from Epiphanius, that the *Nazu-*

* Beauſobre, Moſheim, Walchius, & Dav. Michaelis; the laſt has writ a tract, *De indiciis Gnoſticæ philoſophiæ tempore 70 interpretum & Philonis Judæi* publiſhed in his *Syntagma Commentationum. part 2d. Gotting.* 1767. This has been oppoſed by Titman in a tract *de Veſtigiis Gnoſticorum in Nov. Teſtam. fruſtra quæſitis, Lipſiæ.* 1773: which ſo far as reſpects the *hiſtoric* part of his proofs, that the Gnoſtics were later than the time of St. John, is too full of errors to prove any thing.

*rites* (a Jewiſh ſect, until they afterwards became incorporated with the Chriſtian ſects of Ebionites, &c.) rejected the Pentateuch as not being the compoſition of Moſes, and conſequently along with that they rejected the account of the creation there; therefore they were in a fair road to Gnoſticiſm. But even if Gnoſticiſm had not been current among the Jews before Chriſtianity appeared; yet what we know of it as a Chriſtian hereſy proves, that the doctrine of the *Logos* could not have been introduced into Chriſtianity from Platoniſm by Juſtin in the middle of the ſecond century; becauſe it had always been a chief tenet among the Gnoſtics long before, and they are ſuppoſed rather to have borrowed from Oriental Philoſophy, than from Plato. Simon the firſt Gnoſtic converſed with St. Peter, as we read in the *Acts*; and Cerinthus the next is ſuppoſed by the Fathers to have been as antient, therefore they began their ſects before the deſtruction of Jeruſalem in the year 70; which was 20 years before the Fathers ſuppoſe St. John to have writ his goſpel, and 70 years before Juſtin. How then could either St. John or Juſtin have firſt *introduced* the doctrine of the *Logos?* And not rather as Le Clerc contends, have only *explained* the true nature of the *Logos*, that he was

equal

equal with the Father, and not a ſubordinate Divinity, as the Gnoſtics ſuppoſed. Accordingly Mr. Lindſey in this point is more conſiſtent than Dr. P; for he accuſes Juſtin only of having *contributed* to bring in the doctrine of the *Logos*, which the Gnoſtics had firſt introduced.* The age however in which the two firſt Chriſtian Gnoſtics lived, by being ſtill later than Philo, and Chriſt, does not indeed prove the currency of the doctrine of the *Logos* among the Jews before Philo; yet the circumſtance, that Simon was a Samaritan, and Cerinthus a Jew, conſequently their diſciples either Jews or Samaritans, gives ſome preſumption that both Jews and Samaritans muſt have been familiarized with the doctrine of the *Logos* long before: and it ſeems to have been no point of diſpute among them, whether there was any divine *Logos* or not; but only whether he did not *appear* in Simon after Jeſus was dead; and whether he was really not united to *man*, but according to Cerinthus tho' not *born* with, yet united to Jeſus

* "Thoſe very early fathers, Juſtin Martyr and Irenæus, although free from any thing bordering on the extravagancies (of the Gnoſtics) did nevertheleſs *contribute* to bring into Chriſtianity the Platonic doctrine of a *ſecond God*, which they had learnt before their converſion to faith." *Apolog. p.* 158.

at baptiſm. Accordingly heterodox writers alſo, and even humaniſts themſelves have acknowledged the antiquity of belief in the divine *Logos* among the Jews. The heterodox author of the *Eſſay on Spirit* ſays, "The *antient Jews* made a ſecond eſſence of the *Logos*, which they called a ſecond God," p. 43. Another of the ſame ſtamp in his *vindication of the naked Goſpel*, as I find quoted by Bp. Bull, allows that *the Jews* had introduced the Platonic doctrine of the *Logos* and other opinions into the *Jewiſh church*, before they gained footing in the Chriſtian. "Theſe were the opinions of *the Jews*, in the time of our Savior and his apoſtles, and hence it has perhaps happened, that ſeveral Platonic expreſſions are found in the New Teſtament, eſpecially in St. John."* Thus we find at laſt, that the humaniſts confute each other; and that the pretended corruption in Chriſtianity through Platoniſm, which Zwicker, Lindſey and Dr. Prieſtley attribute to the Chriſtian philoſophers, about the time of Juſtin in the middle of the ſecond century, is by the above authors fixed one hundred years ſooner; and ſuppoſed to have been

* Bulli *primitiva traditio*, cap. 5. ſect. 7.

effec-

effected by the very firſt diſciples of the apoſtles, by Jewiſh Chriſtians, and by the whole body of Jews, who firſt corrupted the Jewiſh religion; and this as they ſay, corrupted the Chriſtian church. If ſuch was the caſe, where ſhall we find that *original* Chriſtianity, after which Dr. P. has been making ſuch reſearches, and of which he affirms, that he can find many *hiſtoric traces?* I am afraid, that he muſt reſtrain himſelf to the proteſtant maxim of finding original Chriſtianity only in the Bible, if he will not admit of orthodoxy as an interpreter: any impartial enquirer who ſhall reject that, will find ſimilar, and indeed ſtronger reaſons to reject the authority of any other Chriſtian body in antient times, Jews or Greeks. But firſt of all he ſhould teach us how to reſiſt the weight of the above evidence and authorities, antient and modern, concerning the Polytheiſtic theology of the Jews themſelves, maintained we ſee by humaniſts as well as orthodox writers; inſtead of exculpating the Jews by mere aſſertions to the contrary: as to modern authorities indeed, I conſider theſe in no other light, than as affording preſumptions, that thoſe, who have ſupplied them had either ſome other evidence for their opinion, which they have not made public; or at leaſt that

ſuch

ſuch as I have collected, had ſtruck them with the ſame force, that it does myſelf; more eſpecially when it reſpects heterodox authors, who can have had no prepoſſeſſions in favor of orthodoxy to bias their judgment; in any other ſenſe than this I make no appeals to modern authorities. To profeſs to write an *hiſtoric account* without evidence to ſupport one's *aſſertions*, is in fact, only to write a ſpeculative romance; and no other evidence has been produced concerning the diſbelief of the Jews in the Divinity of the Meſſiah, than the mere article of his not being *born* divine: but this circumſtance, as I have proved from the writings of Jews themſelves, formed no obſtacle to their belief of an union afterwards of *Divinity* with *humanity* in the perſon of their Meſſiah; which is confirmed by it's having been the actual belief of ſeveral claſſes of the Gnoſtics, and of all the firſt Chriſtian Sectaries, who had been converted from Judaiſm; whence ariſes another preſumptive evidence, that it had been alſo the belief of the Jews themſelves.

Now as to the manner how Divinity and humanity can be united in the ſame perſon, this we can no more conceive, than how an intelligent principle can in man be united

united to the inert nature of matter: but there can be no reaſon aſſigned, why ſuch an union may not be juſt as well effected in the maturity of life, as at the moment of conception; and even if it was ever ſo impoſſible or abſurd, this is totally foreign to our enquiries, which reſpect merely the hiſtoric facts themſelves relative to the belief of the Jews and heretic Chriſtians. Neither have we any concern with the *origin* of Jewiſh theology; it might probably be a medley of Chaldaiſm, Platoniſm and of the ſpeculative philoſophy of the Jews themſelves, by their giving a *perſonification* (as Dr. P. expreſſes it) to their abſtract ideas of the attributes of God; juſt as the heathens formed their Deities of *juſtice*, *piety*, *public virtue*, and many others. So that although the Jews after their return from Babylon no longer worſhipped *corporeal idols*; yet they ſeem to have done little better than exchange one kind of polytheiſm for another, by ſupplying their place with *ideal divinities*: for Polytheiſm is not the leſs ſo, becauſe the Jews might arrive at it in a different mode from the Greeks; and whether the Greeks added *Divinity* to the actual *perſonality* of deceaſed heroes, or the Jews added *perſonality* to their ideal conceptions of the *divine attributes*, the effect would be juſt the ſame in multiplying

the

the objects of divine worſhip; it can only be ſaid, that the Polytheiſm of the Jews was not of ſo groſs and unphiloſophic a a kind as that of the Greeks. But in my own opinion the Jews derived more from their own ſpeculations than from Plato; for all which Philo ſays concerning the *mediatorial* office of the *Logos*, as an interceſſor between God and man, muſt be native Jewiſh ideas, or are at leaſt not to be found in Plato; they ſeem therefore to have been original notions of the Jewiſh doctors of theology in that age, relative to the Meſſiah:* why then may not the participation of *Divinity* by the *Logos* be likewiſe a native Jewiſh tenet, and not borrowed at all from Plato? Readers have in a variety of caſes been too apt to ſuppoſe, that every reſemblance contains an imitation: but, although the imitation could be ever ſo well aſcertained here, this will not deſtroy the reality of the fact, that ſuch opinions were current among the Jews, in the time of our Saviour; there is no proof

* Thus he calls the Logos—μεθοριος—ικετης των θνητων προς το αφθαρτον—πρεσβευτης του ἡγεμονος προς το ὑπηκοον—Αρχιερευς, ὁς καθαιρει και κενοι ψυχην ἁμαρτηματων, &c. See Le Clerc's notes on *Joh. c.* 1. medius terminus inter Deum & hominem——Supplex pro mortales apud naturam incorruptibilem, &c.

that

that Philo was the only Jewiſh imitator of Platoniſm; and even if he was, yet it is preſumeable, that he muſt have found ſome ſimilar opinions concerning God and the Meſſiah, current among the Jews themſelves, before he attempted to aſſimilate Jewiſh theology ſtill more to Platoniſm. Whether then, Le Clerc's ſuppoſition be true or not, that St. John alluded to thoſe platonic expreſſions which had been received among the Jews, and directed the Chriſtians how far they were true or falſe; yet this very ſuppoſition preſuppoſes alſo the fact, that ſu h opinions, as well as expreſſions were current in Jewiſh theology, before the introduction of Chriſtianity. If the learned and philoſophic part of the Jews, did thus actually allow a ſubordinate Divinity to the Meſſiah; much more muſt we expect to find ſuch an opinion prevalent among the enthuſiaſtic multitude in the Jewiſh nation, who could not be expected to be capable of reſtraining themſelves within the bounds of nice philoſophic diſtinctions. If the purity of Jewiſh belief did not prevent the learned among the Jews from admitting into Jewiſh theology, ſpeculations concerning the Deity whether drawn from the fancies of Platoniſm, or other Heathen philoſophy; it can

not be preſumed, that the vulgar could better reſiſt the examples and practice of many Heathen nations around them, ſuch as the Babylonians and others; who believed, that Divinity was communicated to, dwelt or reſided in their kings upon the throne: which indeed was an opinion ſo current in Heathen ages, that even the rational Romans deified their emperors both alive and dead; and ſome relics of that antient popular opinion are ſtill remaining in Thibet and other Oriental countries. In fine, ſo very thin and equivocal was the partition between Divinity and humanity in antient times, that a participation of both, or a tranſmutation of the one into the other, was eſteemed a matter of no great difficulty either in belief or practice.* In the Old Teſtament we find the election and deſignation of the prophets to have been accompanied with many extraordinary operations of divine power; to the election and deſignation of the Meſſiah popular belief ſeems to have attributed ſome ſtill ſuperior exertions, and even an actual communication of Divinity itſelf, to the meſſenger, mediator

* Philo himſelf allows, "that it was more eaſy for a God to become a man, than for a man to become a God." Θαττον γαρ αν εις ανθρωπον θεον η εις θεον ανθρωπον μεταβαλειν. *Leg. ad Caium.*

and

and interceſſor employed between God and man; as indeed the explications of Jonathan ſuggeſt, the theology of Philo confirm, and the belief of the firſt chriſtianizing Jews almoſt demonſtrate. Upon the whole then, if candor and accuracy be taken as guides in this enquiry, it will not by any means appear as a *certain* truth, that the *antient* Jews have any pretence to be ranked among thoſe, whom Dr. P. ſtyles *antient Unitarians*; but on the contrary, that there is much, and very ſtrong evidence againſt their claim: and indeed to ſo great a degree is this true, that it may rather be to Jewiſh theology itſelf, that we are indebted for thoſe very tenets, which Dr. P. conſiders as corruptions in modern Chriſtianity, and which in his zeal againſt orthodoxy he has erroneouſly attributed to the ſecond century: but of which we ſee, that there are ſufficient traces extant, of their having a more antient ſource; and they were apparently, if indeed not original parts of Chriſtianity, yet brought into it out of Jewiſh theology by the firſt chriſtianizing Jews themſelves; which tenets alſo, if the antient orthodox found a difficulty to explain and defend, the modern Humaniſts find as great a difficulty to remove conſiſtently with Scripture and the hiſtory of Chriſtian belief in the firſt ages.

So that although the Humaniſts had ever ſo much reaſon to ſuppoſe, that ſome traits of Platoniſm had been incorporated with orthodoxy, yet it would be an unjuſt accuſation, that it was done by the philoſophic converts to Chriſtianity about the time of Juſtin; of whom there is no reaſon to ſuſpect but that they tranſmitted Chriſtianity to us in the ſame purity, that they received it from the firſt Jewiſh Chriſtians and preachers: but it was more probably through the medium of Jewiſh theology that ſuch Platoniſm gained admiſſion and through the Jewiſh Chriſtians themſelves; if indeed there were any grounds to ſuſpect any ſuch platonic corruptions at all in orthodox Chriſtianity. Accordingly Le Clerc conceived, that it was to the Jewiſh Chriſtians, as well as to the philoſophizing Gnoſtics, that St. John addreſſed his firſt chapter, in order to guard them againſt thoſe notions of a ſubordinate *Logos*, which they might imbibe from the current Jewiſh theology of that age: It was moſt probably addreſſed to *all* claſſes of ſuch miſbelievers.

But finally, even if it were ever ſo *certain*, that the Jews of that age expected nothing but mere humanity in their Meſſiah, yet no concluſion can be drawn hence againſt the divine nature of Chriſt; for if the expectations

pectations of the Jews were to be received as the teſt of truth, by the very ſame argument it might be proved, that the Meſſiah was not yet arrived, and that when he does arrive, he is to be a worldly, not a ſpiritual king; Juſtin had long ago reprobated this argument.* All then, which can be concluded from the ſuppoſed belief of the Jews in the mere humanity of the Meſſiah, is, that it would form ſome preſumption of the belief of the firſt chriſtianizing Jews in the ſame tenet: But this *preſumption* is deſtroyed and contradicted by *facts*; for all the hiſtorical information concerning the tenets of the firſt Jewiſh Chriſtians, which has been tranſmitted down to us, will be found to agree in confirming, that they believed in the ſubordinate divinity of *the Chriſt* or *Logos*, agreeably to the theology of Philo, notwithſtanding that they ſuppoſed *Jeſus* to have been *born* a mere man; as I ſhall proceed to prove by putting together a few obſervations on ſome of the leading tenets of the ſeveral firſt Chriſtian Sects.†

* Ea quæ Dei ſunt neque intelligere neque facere unquam voluiſtis [vos Judæi] ſed quæ magiſtrorum veſtrorum ſunt, ſicut ipſe vociferatur divinus Chriſtus." *Dial. Tryph.*

† I may here ſubjoin another teſtimony from *Lightfoot* concerning the belief of the antient Jews as well as later Rabbins in the *pre-exiſtence* and *Divinity* of the Meſſiah. When St. Paul writing to the Hebrews quotes

Thoſe, who attempt to form complete ſyſtems, generally either copy implicitely the old trite errors of others, or introduce new and raſh conjectures of their own, which they work up into all parts of their ſyſtems; whereby they mix truth and error together, and weaken the foundation of the whole, as has been the caſe with Dr. P.: for this reaſon I have preſented new opinions under the form of *Obſervations* only, leaving it to others to examine, whether they be founded in truth or not.

It may perhaps be ſtill alledged by ſome perſons, in order to exculpate the antient Jews from a polytheiſtic theology, that their opinions, as deſcribed by Philo, concerning the *Logos* and other ſubordinate divine Beings, may be only dreſſed up in highly figurative modes of expreſſion; by which in reality they *meant* no more, than

quotes in proof of Chriſt's divinity, from Pſalm 102. *Thou Lord in the beginning haſt laid the foundation of the earth*; Lightfoot obſerves, that the Jews would not refer this to God the father, but to *the Chriſt*, "for ſo they underſtood thoſe words in *Gen.* 1. *The ſpirit of God moved on the face of the waters*, and ſo they interpret it, *This is the ſpirit of Meſſias*, as their mind is ſpoken in that point by *Zohar*, *Beriſhith Rabba* and divers others." *Harmony of New Teſt. Epiſt. Hebr.* Philo gives the ſame account of the *Logos*, that he was the chief agent in the creation. Is not the formation of the creation a ſufficient proof of Divinity? It is in truth the moſt material and beſt known circumſtance in our idea of Divinity.

only

only to deſcribe in a very lively and ſtrong manner the different exertions of the divine attributes in the courſe of their agency concerning human affairs, without intending to attribute any actual *perſonality* to thoſe repreſentations of the divine attributes. Now, although this were ever ſo true, yet it is a mode of exculpating the Jews, which cannot with any *conſiſtency* be employed by the Humaniſts: becauſe they themſelves maintain, that both Plato and Philo do actually aſcribe *perſonality* to the *Logos*; and that the orthodox by *following* them have become in reality polytheiſts likewiſe.* But if there is any other claſs of men, who may think, that Philo and the Jews have only introduced into theologic treatiſes the like bold and figurative expreſſions, as are employed ſometimes by orators and poets; it will ſtill follow hence, that even this claſs are not *conſiſtent* with themſelves, unleſs they equally abſolve from polytheiſm all other bodies of men, heathens as well as Romaniſts by an application of the ſame principle of vindication. For what is the

* The trinity of the Platoniſts, at leaſt the ſecond perſon in it, probably had its origin from *perſonification*; and in this the Chriſtians were too ready to *follow* them, by converting the Logos of St John into a *proper perſon*. *Dr. P's. letter to Dr. H. part.* 1. 68. "The Logos of the Platoniſts had in their opinion always had a *perſonal* exiſtence." *Ibid.* 72. See alſo above at *p.* 58 and 62 in note.

polytheiſm

polytheiſm of which the proteſtants accuſe the Romaniſts, except a ſimiſar lively and expreſſive repreſentation to the bodily ſenſes of divine perſons, truths and facts by means of viſible images, juſt as Philo does by mental images? theſe are only different modes of repreſentation. And has not Plutarch in like manner attempted to explain away all the polytheiſm of the Egyptians, by reducing it to a ſyſtem of figurative and philoſophical inſtruction by means of allegorical perſonages?* Similar attempts have been often made concerning the theology of Homer; which have alſo been very lately renewed by a no leſs celebrated critic than *Heyne*.† When therefore I impute *dæmonidolatry* to the antient Jews and Philo, it is only in the ſame popular ſenſe, that it is imputed by Mr. Lindſey to others:‡ we ought not to exempt in an humourſome and partial manner thoſe, whom we wiſh to favor; and condemn all others, where it is not eaſy to fix upon any certain and diſcriminating circumſtances of difference between them.

* De Iſide & Oſiride.

† "Opinatur cl. Heyne ante Homerum antiquiores poetas fuiſſe, qui tam verborum inopiâ quam ingenti res ipſas ſub oculis ſubjiciendi impetu cæleſtia corpora & virtutes naturales in *perſonas* tranſmutaſſe, earum que origines, proprietates & mixturas Deorum connubiis, prælliſque adumbraſſe: his tandem ſuperveniſſe Homerum, &c." *Commentar. Scient. Gotting. tom.* 8. & *Meiners de vero Deo. pars prima. p.* 172. *Lemgov.* 1780.

‡ Apology. p. 28.

# CRITICAL OBSERVATIONS

ON

# BOOKS

ANTIENT AND MODERN.

## NUMBER X.

To be continued occaſionally.

CONTAINING

Additional Evidence from Philo and other Jewiſh Authorities, that Logos was a well known Name for the Meſſiah in Jewiſh Theology; from this Jewiſh Source it was that St. John and the firſt Chriſtians derived their Knowledge both of that Name and Character of Divine Logos, which they applied to Chriſt, even in the Confeſſion of M. Baſnage himſelf; and it was not an Innovation introduced by the Greek Fathers from Platoniſm, as the Unitarians have erroneouſly alleged. From the ſame Source of Jewiſh Theology were tranſmitted by the Jewiſh Chriſtians to the Greek Fathers various Errors, which proved the chief Cauſe of ſeparating Chriſtians into different Sects; and from thence alſo were derived the chief Corruptions of the Roman Church, not from Heatheniſm. So that Jewiſh Theology has been the grand Corrupter of Chriſtianity.

Hodie is ad philoſophandum videtur aptior, in quo liberior eſt licentia fingendi quod volucrit. Joh. Saliſb. l. 7.

LONDON:

Sold by B. WHITE, Fleet Street, 1795.

*Connexion of the Subjects, which are to be now diſcuſſed, both with my Remarks on the Greek Fathers in the foregoing Part of this Fourth Volume, and alſo with my Appendix to it concerning the Belief of the Ebionites in a ſubordinate Divinity of the Chriſt.*

MY foregoing *Remarks on the Fathers* in this Volume, publiſhed in 1785, were put together, in order from the evidence of thoſe antient Chriſtians (the only evidence now extant) to prove the truth of ſome *Facts*, which I had aſſerted in my *Diſcourſe* in 1784; namely, that although Dr. Prieſtley has attempted to miſlead the Public with repeated Romances concerning ſwarms of antient Unitarians, as he affects to call them, who flouriſhed at the commencement of Chriſtianity, yet that in reality no chriſtian ſectaries have been, or can be ſhewn by any perſon to have ever exiſted (at leaſt not during the firſt two centuries) who held the *chief principle* of the modern Unitarians concerning the Chriſt being a mere man, and not poſſeſſed of a divine nature either in the higheſt or

in ſome more ſubordinate degree*: neither did any ſuch ſect exiſt even in later ages, until Socinus at the beginning of the 16th century. Hence it follows, that Unitarianiſm can form no claim whatever to the appellation of original Chriſtianity from the information of *Hiſtory*, and the evidence of *Antiquity*; but this modern philoſophic Chriſtianity muſt depend altogether for its ſupport on novel interpretations, which the Unitarians give to the ſame paſſages of Scripture, that were employed by the antient Chriſtians to prove the divinity of Chriſt, ſuch as the beginning of St. John's Goſpel &c and which were always underſtood, even by heathens themſelves, in the ſame ſenſe as by the antient Chriſtians†.

* It may help to ſhew what miſtakes writers fall into, through want of attention, if I obſerve here, that Mr. Barnard in his *Divinity of Chriſt demonſtrated* (1789) has the following paſſage, "I ſuppoſe, becauſe the *Unitarians* among the Gentiles are not mentioned under *that* denomination by any of the antient writers, or under that of *Alogi*, this is the reaſon why the author of *Crit. Obſerv.* ſays, *no ſuch chriſtians ever exiſted, except in Utopia*," p. 231. Now certainly *my* reaſon was not, becauſe no ſectaries had ſuch *a denomination*, but becauſe none held ſuch *a principle* as the mere humanity of Chriſt; which had been ſo frequently expreſſed by me, that I thought it impoſſible to be miſtaken: accordingly even the heterodox Dr. P. underſtood me rightly, although the orthodox Mr. B. did not.

† Thus Amelius, one of the ſecond Platoniſts, about the year 250, literally quotes the words of St. John and

In conformity with this object, I have ſhewn, in my foregoing *Remarks*, that *the Jews* themſelves, and in my *Appendix*, that ſuch *antient Chriſtian ſectaries* likewiſe as adhered to Judaiſm, the Cerinthians, Ebionites and others, had all of them both in their popular opinions, and philoſophic principles, exalted the Meſſiah and Chriſt to ſome high degree of Divinity, inſtead of having abaſed him, like our modern Humanitarians, to mere humanity*. I had

and explains them like the orthodox Chriſtians, as meaning by *Logos* a *perſon* and *God*. Λογον ὡς ὁ βαρβαρος [Ιωαννης] αξιοι, προς θεον ειναι και θεον ειναι, δι ὃ παντα γεγενησθαι—και σαρκα ενδυσαμενον παλιν θεον ειναι, οιος ην προ ὑ εις το σωμα καταχθηναι, *Verbum, ſicut barbarus ille Johannes exiſtimat, apud Deum fuiſſe, et Deum fuiſſe, per quem cuncta ſunt facta—carnemque indutum rurſus Deum extitiſſe, qualis fuiſſet antequam in corpus deſcendiſſet.* This explication of St. John by Amelius, is an indubitable proof againſt Crellius and other Unitarians, that both the right *reading* of the text and the right *tranſlation* of it have been given by orthodox Chriſtians, agreeably to the natural ſenſe, while Greek was a living language.

* Dr. Prieſtley often objects to there being different degrees of Divinity: now whether ſuch an objection be ſolid or not, in *philoſophic ſpeculation*, is foreign from our purpoſe; we have no concern except with the *hiſtoric fact*, that both heathens, and all Chriſtian ſectaries did allow of ſuch different degrees of Divinity.—I formerly objected to the name *Unitarian* as not expreſſing the chief principle of that ſect, the mere humanity of Chriſt: I therefore preferred *Humaniſt*, but

as

intended to purſue a ſimilar enquiry with reſpect to the belief of all *later Chriſtian ſectaries* during the firſt two centuries, ſuch as the Nazarenes, Theodotians, Artemonites, &c. But I found my further progreſs interrupted by ſome obſervations of Dr. Prieſtley on the proofs, which I had already produced, ſome of which related to the belief of *the antient Jews*, and others to the belief of *the Ebionites**; in order therefore, that I might not intermix thoſe two ſubjects promiſcuouſly, I determined to ſuſpend ſome *additions* and *replies* which I had propoſed to make concerning the belief of *the Jews*, until I had finiſhed my enquiry concerning the belief of *the Ebionites*, as the latter ſubject was then more immediately under public conſideration; and I threw it into the form of an *Appendix* to this Volume, in order that it might be afterwards read agreeably to the proper order of arrangement, notwithſtanding that in order of publication it preceded

as Mr. Hobhouſe and other Unitarians have now adopted *Humanitarian*, I readily follow their example.

* In his remarks on my *Diſcourſe*, at the end of his ſermon *on Free Enquiry*, 1785—and in his *Letters to Dr. Horſeley, part* 3, 1786, p. 56.—together with his *Defences of Unitarianiſm* for 1787, p. 71.

theſe *additions* to the article of *Jewiſh theology*; for from this it was, that *Ebionite theology* took its chief riſe, and derived many of its own principles. This ſuſpended ſubject then of *Jewiſh theology*, and of the opinions current in it relative to the ſuperhumanity of the Meſſiah, I now reſume in *addition* to, in *confirmation* and *defence* of what I have already advanced upon that ſubject in my foregoing *Remarks on the Fathers**. I ſhall not however, follow Dr. Prieſtley ſtep by ſtep through his wilderneſs of error and confuſion; for I have always thought, that a faithful and connected exhibition of *truth* contains of itſelf *in general* a ſufficient refutation of *error*, with all ſuch readers as are willing to ſee the truth, and the conſequences which neceſſarily follow after it. The more particular views then, which at any time I take of Dr. Prieſtley's miſtakes, are not intended perſonally to refute him only, but in order to introduce various ſubjects connected with the principal matter under conſideration, and thereby to throw additional light on the chief articles of our

* That this ſubject has been ſo long delayed, has been owing entirely to the intervention of other literary enquiries, together with avocations from ill health, domeſtic and worldly affairs.

enquiries;

enquiries; by obviating ſuch doubts and removing ſuch difficulties, as might otherwiſe ariſe in the minds even of unprejudiced readers: whereby they might be prevented from perceiving the *true ſtate* of that *popular theology*, which was current among the Jews during the age of Chriſt, and poſſibly for a long time before; but at leaſt ever ſince the reign of Alexander Jannæus, about a century before Chriſt, after whoſe death the Phariſees, who promoted this adventitious and exotic theology, gained a complete aſcendency over the Scribes or Karaites, who oppoſed it, and whom the Phariſees both then and ſince ſtigmatized as being Sadducees; a falſe accuſation however which they have nevertheleſs continued down to this very day.

*The exiſtence, nature and origin of the popular theology current among the Jews in the age of Chriſt, illuſtrated and confirmed by the teſtimony of Baſnage--from this was derived by St. John and other Jewiſh Chriſtians both the idea and name of a divine Logos in the confeſſion of Baſnage himſelf, therefore not from Platoniſm either by them or by Juſtin a century later. The opinion of Baſnage againſt the belief of the Jews in the divinity of the Meſſiah ſhewn*

*ſhewn not to be ſupported by him with ſatisfactory proofs--neither can the acknowledgment of the Greek Fathers, that the Jews of the 2d and 3d centuries profeſſed ſuch a diſbelief, nor yet the teſtimony of the preſent Jews concerning the ſuppoſed diſbelief of their anceſtors, be admitted as ſufficient counter-evidence againſt thoſe expreſs words of the antient Jews themſelves, which I have produced in my preceding Remarks.*

IT is not a real fact, as Dr. Prieſtley ſeems to conceive, that all *Jewiſh Theology* was founded on, and derived from their own Scriptures, or that they admitted of no articles of religious belief, except ſuch as we ourſelves may be able to deduce from the Jewiſh Bible;* for there was alſo current among them an adventitious theology, ſuperadded to that dictated by the Jewiſh Scriptures, and which the Jews had collected from various ſources as well as in different ages; partly from the Chaldeans and Egyptians, and partly in later times from the popular and philoſophic opinions of the heathen nations around them, particularly from the Greeks, after

* See Note to p. 35.

a king-

a kingdom of Greeks had been eſtabliſhed in Syria by Alexander about 300 years before Chriſt. This corrupt popular theology among the Jews was, with reſpect to original Judaiſm, ſimilar to that, which (as the Proteſtants alledge) had been ſuperadded by the Romaniſts to original Chriſtianity; and was derived in part from the ſame corrupt ſources of Heatheniſm, yet like Romaniſm, intermixed with and attempted to be ſupported by principles and expreſſions contained in their own Scriptures. But whatever different opinions different perſons may entertain concerning the *origin* of that heterogeneous maſs of Jewiſh Theology, this is totally foreign from the other queſtion concerning the *hiſtoric fact* of its actual *exiſtence* among the Jews in the age of Philo and Chriſt: and whether the belief of the Jews in the divinity of their Meſſiah, or in a divine Logos, who was to figure as the Meſſiah, was derived only from this popular theology thus corrupted by Heatheniſm; or whether thoſe articles of belief were ſuggeſted to the Jews at firſt by means of oral traditions from their prophets or by the written words of their own Scriptures, ſo as to be ſtrictly deducible from the right ſenſe of them; theſe again are queſtions, concerning which different

different perſons may hold different opinions, while they all find themſelves forced by evidence ſtill extant, to allow the *hiſtoric fact* itſelf, that ſuch opinions did actually prevail among the Jews as early as the time of Chriſt. When therefore I ſpeak dubiouſly concerning the *origin* of any opinions prevalent among the Jews, it is not from being always myſelf really doubtful about them; but in order to ſhew that it is foreign from the object before us, and that any opinion concerning the *origin* of any articles in Jewiſh theology, is not material to the deciſion of the other queſtion concerning the *fact* of their actual *exiſtence* and *currency* among the *body* of that people*.

Agreeably then to this merely *hiſtoric object* of enquiry, the proofs, which I have given in my foregoing *Remarks* (concerning the *fact* of the belief of the Jews in the ſubordinate divinity of their Meſſiah) have been deduced partly from *antient* evidence, ſuch as the writings of the Jew

* Hence we ſee how foreign it is from the queſtion, for Dr. P. to affirm "that the rank of *God* given to Chriſt made a ſyſtem *entirely different* from that of the Jews, as laid down in the *old teſtament*" —and again "no Jew had *originally* any idea of their Meſſiah being more than man." See p. 35 above.

Philo and the Chaldee paraphraſes on the Jewiſh Scriptures, writings cotemporary with Chriſt, together with the interpretations of Scripture by later Jewiſh commentators; and partly from *modern* evidence, from the acknowledgment of able authors, and ſome of theſe even heterodox ones, concerning the truth of the ſame fact; an acknowledgment, in which they could ſcarcely have thus uniformly agreed, if they had not been all conſcious of there being ſtrong *antient* evidence to ſupport it.

Now to this combined evidence Dr. P. has thought it ſufficient and poſſibly other Humanitarians may think the ſame, to ſtate the objections and *counter evidence* contained in the ſubjoined paſſages of one of his tracts; and we may reaſonably preſume, that he has here at firſt produced his ſtrongeſt evidence: which does not however conſiſt in any attempt to invalidate the force of *my proofs*, ſo much as in oppoſing to them counter proofs from the *Greek Fathers* of the 2d and 3d centuries, from the *modern Jews*, and the *opinion* of M. Baſnage*, whereby he would make the

* "As to the attempt of the author of *Critical Obſervations* to prove, that the *body of the Jewiſh nation* really believed in the pre-exiſtence and divinity of their Meſſiah, it muſt appear perfectly futile to any perſon,

evidence extant on this ſubject ſeem to be at variance.

perſon, who ſhall read what they will find on that ſubject in my *Hiſtory of early Opinions concerning Chriſt* (Vol. 3. b. 3.) He will there find, that even the *Chriſtian Fathers*, eager as they were to preſs the Jewiſh Scriptures into the ſervice of the doctrine of the Trinity, did not pretend to have the body of the Jewiſh nation on their ſide: and would they not have been as glad as this author now appears to be, to have found that belief among them? To prove the eaſy reception of the doctrine of the divinity of Chriſt in the primitive times, the author muſt find the doctrine of the divinity of the Meſſiah to have been the *general belief* of the *Jewiſh nation* in the age of *the Apoſtles*. The opinion of ſuch a Platoniſt as Philo, if we could be ſure of it, can never paſs for that of the Jewiſh nation in general, who were not Platoniſts; neither does Philo ſay, that the Jews in general interpreted the Scriptures as he did.——Let him firſt *anſwer* what the learned Baſnage, who was a Trinitarian, has written on the ſubject, and then I will conſider his arguments. I am indeed aſtoniſhed, that neither Dr. Horſeley nor this author ſhould ſo much as mention the name of Baſnage in treating of this ſubject, which he has ſo learnedly and ſo ably diſcuſſed, and who has ſo particularly conſideredwha t *Cudworth*, *Allix* and *Bull* had advanced upon it. What will *foreigners* ſay of Engliſhmen ſtill *retailing* the *ſtale arguments* of the three writers above-mentioned, without any notice of what has been replied to them by ſuch a man as this.

I am not much acquainted with the Jewiſh cabaliſts except through the medium of Baſnage and others, therefore I will not anſwer for the meaning of the writer quoted by our author at his p. 86: But it is of no ſignification what his meaning was; for what

Let us then conſider *firſt*, the *opinion* of Baſnage, ſince he is pointed out by Dr. P. as having long ago *refuted* not only what I have myſelf advanced, but alſo the evidence and arguments of all other writers.

Now it is there deſired, "that I would ſhew in which of the *middle ages* the doctrine [of the mere humanity of the Meſſiah] was firſt introduced among the Jews, &c." But this is a requeſt, with which I have no neceſſary concern; it is ſufficient for my purpoſe to have ſhewn, that the contrary doctrine of the divinity of the Meſſiah was an *antient* one among them, as antient as the age of Chriſt himſelf; and that *relics* of it ſtill continued among the Jews in much later times, as appears from the

ſome *particular* Jewiſh cabaliſts (whoſe writings are remarkable for their ænigmatical obſcurity) may have ſaid in a *later* period, is nothing to the purpoſe. In my hiſtory above-mentioned the author will find the moſt expreſs teſtimony, that the Jews in every age from our Saviour's time to the preſent, were believers in the ſimple humanity of their Meſſiah.—Since this was indiſputably the caſe, both *in the time of the Chriſtian Fathers*, and among *the preſent Jews*, let the author ſhew in which of the *middle ages* that doctrine was firſt introduced, how far it ſpread, and when it was deſerted by them." Remarks on 9th Number of Obſervations on Books, &c. p. 57 and 60. at the end of Letters to Dr. Horſeley, Part 3. 1786.

Chaldee

Chaldee paraphraſes and from that philoſophic theology, which is contained in thoſe commentaries of Jewiſh authors on their own ſcriptures, which have in modern times been called cabaliſtic ones: it is poſſible however, that *ſome* Jews might even in thoſe *antient* times have nevertheleſs adhered to the mere humanity of their Meſſiah, ſince they certainly conceived, that he was to be deſcended from David. It is not then neceſſary for me to prove his divinity to have been the *univerſal* opinion, but only that it was well known and *generally* received by the *body* of the people. I myſelf therefore might with more propriety aſk of Dr. P. to ſhew in which of the *middle ages* the doctrine was firſt introduced concerning the divinity of the Meſſiah, if it was not a *relic* of that more *antient* and general doctrine which had prevailed among the Jews in the age of Chriſt: even his own favorite Baſnage tells him " He cannot conceive, that the enemies of the Chriſtian religion would have taken up their *Shibboleth*". (4. 24. 15). Other authors however, have long ago anſwered the queſtion required, and ſhewn, that when the Jews found the Chriſtians to have taken up the doctrine of the divinity of the Meſſiah, and the Jewiſh appellation

for

for him of *the divine Logos*; then the Jews themſelves began to abandon the *opinions* and *expreſſions* of their own popular theology, out of oppoſition to Chriſtianity, and even to alter their interpretations of many prophecies of their ſcriptures relative to the Meſſiah*: And are not the *opinions* of theſe ſubjoined authors juſt as good *modern evidence* on one ſide of the

* "I conceive the Chaldee paraphraſes to repreſent the ſenſe of the Jews of that age [viz. during, or ſoon after Chriſt] as being their public interpretation of the ſcriptures; wherefore what we find in them, we cannot but think the *vulgar and general* opinion of that nation—But between the time of Celſus and Origen in the year 230 (I gueſs about 60 years) the Jews had learned to *deny* that notion of the *Logos*, that they might with more color reject St. John." *Pearſon on the Creed, p.* 118—148.

"When the Jews found the arguments, which the Chriſtians uſed from their ſcriptures to prove, that the Meſſiah was come, preſſed hard upon their opinions, which they could not fairly defend, and the comments and interpretations of their *antient Rabbins* to be favorable to the Chriſtian faith; they acted with the ſame zeal againſt the Chriſtians, as theſe did againſt one another, and by giving new, forced and unnatural interpretations to the texts of Scripture, which made againſt them, have ſo confounded themſelves, that they at preſent ſcarcely know what they believe; and finding all attempts in vain to anſwer the Chriſtians, they ſeem at laſt to have acquieſced in looking upon their prophecies of the Meſſiah, as a myſtery not to be enquired into." *Letters of Ben. Mordecai, Vol.* 1. 372.

queſtion

queſtion as the *opinion* of Baſnage on the other, even if it was ever ſo much in oppoſition to them: but the real fact is, that Baſnage does not ſo directly oppoſe theſe opinions as Dr. P. repreſents, who confounds what Baſnage ſays againſt the belief of a trinity by the Jews, with his opinion and arguments againſt their belief of the divinity of the Meſſiah*. Is the ſubjoined language that of a writer, who totally rejects the belief by the Jews of a divine Meſſiah? Certainly not: on the contrary he declares, both that ſeveral prophecies had foretold it, and that later [Jewiſh] writers had *ſpoken more clearly* than they. What then does Baſnage deny? Nothing more, than that the *relations* in the goſpels contain any evidence of the belief of the Jews in this divinity; whereby *a part* of the more antient evidence for it, which he

* "It ſignifies little, whether St. John drew his *Logos* from the Chaldee paraphraſes or from Philo—— it is of more weight to examine whether the Jewiſh church expected a Meſſiah, that was above mankind, or whether it had any notion of this divinity. One would think, that it cannot now be reaſonably denied, ſince *we* have produced ſeveral oracles, which *have foretold it*, and that a croud of teſtimonies taken from authors, who have ſucceeded them, and *ſpoken more clearly* than they, are added to thoſe prophecies. However, &c." *Hiſt. of Jews, b. 4. ch. 24. ſect. 20. by Baſnage*, 1708.

had

had mentioned above, is (as he thinks) invalidated†. Now if this fact were ever ſo true, that by accident it has ſo happened, that no evidence to ſupport the opinion of the belief of the Jews in that divinity has been afforded by the *relations* in the goſpels; yet ſuch a *negative* proof drawn from the *ſilence* of the goſpels is not to ſuperſede *poſitive* proofs deduced from the words of Jewiſh authors; accordingly Baſnage himſelf was ſo ſenſible of the fallaciouſneſs of ſuch negative proofs, that as he allows "*a part only*" of the poſitive evidence was hereby invalidated. But neither is the fact itſelf true, that the goſpel is really ſilent concerning the aſſumption of divinity by Jeſus, of which that exclamation of the Jews is a ſufficient proof "Thou that art a man, makeſt thyſelf a God": and the aſſumption of divinity by Jeſus is a ſufficient proof of the belief of the Jews in the divine nature of the Meſſiah, even if

† "However, ſince we muſt do juſtice to the Jew as well as Greek, I own, that when we conſult the goſpel, *part* of the proofs, we have alledged, are invalidated: for neither the Phariſees, nor the Apoſtles ſeem to have any idea of the divinity of the Meſſiah. It is true, the Prophets had ſpoken of it; but there is always a great deal of obſcurity in oracles before their accompliſhment—what is become clear to us was obſcure to them." *Ibid.*

there

there were no others. In regard to the *reaſons* likewiſe which Baſnage goes on to aſſign for ſome *caution* manifeſted by Jeſus in declaring that divinity in himſelf, as well as ſome *indignation* manifeſted by the Jews at ſuch declarations of it, as he did make, theſe are aſcribed by Baſnage, manifeſtly to a falſe motive; when he ſuppoſes along with Dr. P. that either that caution of the one, or indignation of the other, aroſe from the diſbelief of the Jews in the divinity of the Meſſiah: for in reality there is no reaſon to think that they aroſe from any other cauſe than the diſbelief of the Jews, that Jeſus, the Son of a carpenter, was that very divine Meſſiah; as is evident from all the circumſtances related in the context, and from that very exclamation before-mentioned. "Why doſt thou that art a man, make thyſelf a God."* When Baſnage therefore thus

* "In the goſpel our Lord is very circumſpect about his divinity; all this circumſpection had been ill managed, if the people had been prepared to receive the Meſſiah as God. The heretics ſaid, he ſpoke but ſeldom of his divinity, for fear it ſhould be denied, that he was a man: but St. Chryſoſtom hath better hit it, in ſaying, that Chriſt deſigned inſenſibly to accuſtom mankind to a myſtery far beyond the reach of reaſon." *B.* 4. 24. 21. St. Chryſoſtom's reaſon is as far from the apparently real one, as that of the here-

comes at laſt to oppoſe the *antient evidence* for the divinity of the Meſſiah, by the more *modern evidence* from the relations contained in the goſpels, it appears to be of a very futile or at leaſt a very defective nature; amounting to nothing more than a haſty ſuppoſition of a very diſputable *fact*, that none of the parties manifeſt any knowledge of divinity in the expected Meſſiah, together with a very raſh conjecture at the *motives* of their conduct and words, in contradiction to the obvious and probable object in their view: for we can no more conclude from the *caution* of Jeſus, that the Jews diſbelieved the *divinity* of the Meſſiah, than that they diſbelieved the *coming* of a Meſſiah; and we can only conclude, that Jeſus knew they would be prejudiced againſt *himſelf* as being that divine Meſſiah. As to the no leſs idle *motives*, which ſome of the Greek Fathers have aſſigned for that *caution* in Jeſus, they are only the ſuggeſtions of popular oratory, not the reſult of inveſtigation concerning the truth of facts. I can find no foundation then for that encomium, which Dr. P. is pleaſed to beſtow on Baſnage, nor ought

tics, and both ought to have attended more to the context of the goſpels, than to their own imaginations.

it

it to be wondered at, that a writer was neglected by me, who is always reaſoning doubtfully and weakly, when he ought to be proving with ſtrong and coherent evidence: but at leaſt with reſpect to the preſent ſubject I find neither *refutation* nor even any attempt to *obviate* any thing advanced by myſelf. On the contrary he confirms my *arguments* as well as *evidence*, except with reſpect to a ſingle queſtion of *fact*, whether any traces of the belief of the Jews in the divinity of their Meſſiah do or do not appear in the *relations* contained in the goſpels; concerning which fact different perſons may hold different opinions without impeaching the chief fact itſelf, that the body of the Jews did believe in that divinity, notwithſtanding that no ſufficient evidence of it ſhould have appeared in the goſpels, if it does but appear by other good evidence and this from Jews themſelves.

Again, does Baſnage agree with Dr. P. that "Philo was only a ſingular platonic Jew, whoſe opinion could not paſs for that of the Jewiſh nation in general?" No, on the contrary, though Baſnage allows Philo to be a Platoniſt in ſome points, yet he expreſſly affirms, that Philo delivered in his own works the *principles* of the Jews

*in general*, and among others that of the ſubordinate divinity of the Meſſiah, together with the appellation of *Logos*: and Philo was one of thoſe very Jewiſh authors, whom Baſnage allows to ſpeak *more clearly* than the Prophets, although ſtill not always without ſome obſcurity, as well as incoherency*.

In what articles then is it, that Baſnage has *refuted* or even *differed* from me? Has he, like Dr. P, conſidered the doctrines of that Jewiſh philoſophic theology, now called the Cabala, to have been introduced among the Jews not until a later age than that of the Apoſtles and firſt Chriſtians? No, he has declared thoſe doctrines to have exiſted in the Jewiſh nation prior

* "It was not neceſſary to underſtand the Hebrew or Chaldaic tongues to know the *principles* of the Jews; Philo had explained them in Egypt in the Greek tongue; ſo that there was no neceſſity to recur to the ſpring head" (*Sect.* 23.)—"Philo ſpake of the *Logos* a long time before his travelling to Rome, where it is *pretended* he converſed with St. Peter; ſo that neither Chriſtians nor Philoſophers did ſupply him with that *notion*; he drew it from himſelf or rather from *the religion of his fathers, who thoroughly underſtood it.*" (*Sect.* 10.)—"So that Philo conſidered the *Logos* as an organ *inferior* to God in the production of the univerſe—he did ſpeak *plain* upon an intricate ſubject—and the Jews, whoſe opinions *he only copied*, had the ſame ſentiments with him." (*Sect.* 12. *and* 13.)

to

to Chriſt; and even that as their later doctors may have only preſerved the traditions of theſe more antient ones, their evidence is of ſome weight*; and yet Dr. P, altogether rejects it, notwithſtanding that he pretends to follow the opinions of Baſnage in what he ſays of the Cabaliſts, who in reality, neither rejected the teſtimony of the Cabaliſtic commentators any more than that of Philo, as it means to aſcertain the popular belief of the Jews *in general*. M. Simon likewiſe makes not the leaſt doubt but that thoſe later commentaries on the Jewiſh Scriptures, called Cabaliſtic, have, notwithſtanding their being corrupted in later times by magical and myſtical whimſies, preſerved many *relics* of the exotic and more antient theologic opinions current among the Jews†.

* "The ſcience of the Cabaliſts began in the time of Philo and as their [later] doctors may have preſerved the traditions of their fathers, we muſt not refuſe to hear what they ſay." *B.* 4. *ch.* 24. 6. and 15. ——The Cabala muſt have been already advanced into a ſcience in Philo's and our Lord's time—it had its origin in Egypt, and began to ſpread in Judea in our Lord's time." *B.* 3. *ch.* 16. 7. *and* 10.

† "Some of the [antient] Jews did not abſtain from application to platonic philoſophy, of which they made an intermixture with their own reveries, and hence aroſe the chief part of their cabaliſtic ſcience." *Simon's Supplement to his Ceremonies of the Jews. p.* 16. "The Cabaliſts

Has Baſnage diſputed the antiquity and authenticity of the Chaldee paraphraſes or the evidence ariſing thence for the vulgar uſe of the appellation *Logos* among the Jews, and the divinity of the Meſſiah? No, on the contrary, he has confirmed the whole*.

Is it true then, that Baſnage has ably conſidered and replied to what Cudworth, Allix and Bull may have advanced concerning the belief of a trinity by the Jews, or concerning the origin of that belief and the antiquity of it among the Heathens? Now if this were ever ſo true, yet it is of no concern to my cauſe; for I have never undertaken to defend what thoſe authors may have advanced concerning a trinity, or any other ſubject, but only

Cabaliſts have mixed ſome heatheniſh notions with the antient divinity of their fathers, although they have quite forgot their impure origin and labored to uphold them upon ſome texts of ſcripture." *Allix's Judgment of Jewiſh Church. ch.* 23. *p.* 364.

* "The Chaldee paraphraſes are quoted in the *Miſhnah*, which is very antient [about the year 130] —and they could not have been wrote ſince Chriſtianity was acknowledged, becauſe it would have been impoſſible, that the authors, who knew, that the Chriſtians ſo often called their Meſſiah *the Word*, ſhould prefer this very term to all others to expreſs their *Deity* by." B. 4. 24. *Sect.* 15 and 6.

what

what I have advanced myſelf; in which indeed they happen generally to agree with me, though not always; namely, that there *exiſted* among the Jews a popular theology, drawn in part from various exotic ſources, but intermixed with, ſuperadded to, and attempted to be ſupported by the words of their own ſcriptures: in which the appellation *Mimra* in Chaldee, and its proper tranſlation by *Logos* in Greek, were well known as vulgar appellations in *ſome ſenſe* or other, either as Baſnage thinks for *the Deity* only, or as I myſelf maintain, for a Meſſiah likewiſe of a ſubordinate divinity. But with reſpect to the *origin* of this *idea and term*, whether it was derived by the Jews ſolely from their own ſcriptures, or borrowed from Chaldaiſm or Platoniſm, theſe are queſtions not neceſſary to be decided by me; for the deciſion of them will no way alter the ſtate of the *fact itſelf*, that ſuch a term and belief of a *divine Logos* was really current among the Jews, and from them deſcended along with Chriſtianity to the Greek Chriſtians, without any knowledge by the one or the other of any ſimilarity between this opinion and the theology of Plato: until it was firſt diſcovered by ſome of the learned Greek Chriſtians, and Chriſtianity attempted to be

be recommended the better to the heathens on the ſtrength of this diſtant ſimilarity between the two. Thus then a circumſtance, which was employed by them only as an *argument* in favor of Chriſtianity, has been erroneouſly converted by the Ante-trinitarians into the ſource and *origin* of that theologic tenet of the Chriſtians, as if it had been firſt introduced by thoſe Greek Fathers in the 2d century. In this *dirivation* by the Chriſtians of the *idea* and *name* of a divine Logos ſolely from the Jews, Baſnage entirely agrees again with me, and only *differs* in regard to their meaning of the term *Logos* and the divine object to which it was applied by them; in which he is again miſtaken*

* "Without ſtrictly examining what Philo has ſaid concerning the ſubordinate divinity of the Logos, becauſe his expreſſions are very obſcure; I cannot imagine, that St. John undertook to correct the notions of this author [as Le Clerc ſuppoſes] and begun his goſpel in ſo ſublime a manner, only to refute a private perſon. Add further to this that Philo's writings perhaps had never reached Judea or Epheſus: For then the beſt books were ſcarce, and the commerce of the republic of learning very difficult. But ſuppoſing the works of that Jewiſh philoſopher had been better known, can it be imagined, that St. John, who was born a fiſherman, wholly unacquainted with literature, and beſides altogether taken up in preaching the goſpel, ſhould give himſelf the trouble to ſtudy Philo, to correct his ſtile and

For here Baſnage ſeems to ſay (though his words are rather perplexed and doubtful) that when St. John derived the term *Logos* from the Jews he *varied* the meaning and application of it, by employing it as a *name* for Chriſt or the Meſſiah, and that the Jews themſelves only meant *the Deity* by it. Now if the fact of ſuch a variation in the ſenſe of *Logos* by St. John were ever ſo true, yet it will at leaſt ſhew, that St. John meant to aſcribe *divinity* to Chriſt; and that the term Logos was well known

and expreſſions? If it be lawful to make conjectures upon a thing, whereof proofs are wanting, it may be rather ſaid, that *the word* [Logos] was known to the Jews. For the Chaldee Paraphraſts ſpeak often of him. *St. John either had read them or heard them read every Saturday in the Synagogues.* The authors of thoſe paraphraſes had followed the ſtile, which was received in the [Jewiſh] Church, and the manner of denoting *Jehovah* by that of *the word* [Logos]. It is a great deal more likely, that St. John alluded to that term, which was ſo well known in Judæa, than to that of Philo who wrote in Egypt. The Paraphraſts made *the word* a ſupreme Deity and the only God they adored; and St. John might have made uſe of that ſame term to prove, that the *Son* was God, and at the ſame time has diſtinguiſhed him from the Father, and clothed him with a human nature, of which the Paraphraſts and Jews were wholly ignorant. St. John *took hold of a good advantage which a known uſage in his nation* preſented to him; but *he hath grafted upon that uſage* and that name of *the word* a doctrine which Jeſus Chriſt had revealed." *B. 4. ch. 24. ſect. 14.*

to the Jews: but in reality the fact is not true, for at p. 52 above I have ſhewn, that Philo had before St. John applied *Logos* as an appellation for the Meſſiah, or for that ſubordinate divine Being who, as he conceived, was to be united to and reſident in the human Meſſiah from David, agreeably to the philoſophic theology of the Jews in that age. The ſame fact is confirmed by other paſſages in Philo, as I ſhall take opportunity to ſhew.

But it is not merely the Jew Philo (who was cotemporary with Chriſt, and accuſed of intermixing Platonic notions with Judaiſm) it is not he alone, who has thus expreſsly applied the name of Logos to the Meſſiah: for we find that this appellation was both familiar to Jewiſh authors before Philo, and alſo that long ſince Philo and Chriſt the ſame appellation of *Mimra* (which is the Chaldee and Syriac for Logos) has been in frequent uſe with the Chaldee paraphraſts; and that if uſed in other ſenſes, yet it is at leaſt ſometimes expreſsly employed by them as a name for the Meſſiah, juſt as by Philo.* Theſe

* "Carmen Ebedjeſu, i. e. Syriacè *Mimra Ebedjeſu*, ut Syri orientales proferunt, ſeu *Mimro* ut Syri occidentales, è verbo *emar* derivatur, quod *dixit* ſignificat. Igitur *Mimra*, cui græcorum *Logos* reſpondet, *ſermo* eſt

paraphraſts indeed, eſpecially Jonathan on the Prophets, do generally make uſe of the name Meſſias at length, whenever they paraphraſe any paſſages of the old teſtament, which the Jews interpreted as being predictive of the Meſſiah: yet this is not always the caſe; for they do likewiſe ſometimes ſubſtitute *Mimra* (i. e. Logos, *verbum*) inſtead of Meſſias; not that I mean to conclude hence, that *Mimra* has no other meaning with them, but only that among their ſeveral applications of it, one at leaſt is its uſe ſometimes as an appellation to point out the Meſſias. For example, at the 18th verſe of the 49th ch. of Geneſis are theſe words, forming a part of what is called Jacob's Prophecy, "I have waited for thy ſalvation, O Lord!" This has been always conſidered by the Jews as predictive of the Meſſiah: accordingly the pretended Jonathan in his Paraphraſe of the Pentateuch explains the paſſage thus, "Dixit pater noſter Jacob; non expecto ſalutem Gideonis, quæ eſt ſalus temporalis, neque ſalutem Sampſonis, quæ eſt ſalus tranſitoria, ſed expecto *redemptionem Meſſiæ* filii David, qui venturus eſt, ut aggreget ſibi filios

eſt ſeu *oratio.* Homiliæ patrum Syris *Mimre* dicuntur ut et tractatus quilibet, in quo libri auctorum dividi ſolent." *Aſſemani Bibl. orient. tom.* 1. *p.* 3.

Iſrael." But the Jeruſalem paraphraſe of this paſſage (which like that of Jonathan is thought to be a much *later* compoſition than the age of Chriſt) interprets thoſe words thus, "Dixit pater noſter Jacob, non redemptionem Gideonis deſiderat anima mea, etenim illa ad horam eſt [i. e. tranſiens] et non redemptionem Sampſonis, qui etiam redemptionem tranſitoriam attulit ſed redemptionem, quam promiſiſti per *verbum tuum*, ut veniat populo tuo Iſrael." Here then we find *verbum* [Mimra] expreſsly ſubſtituted as a name for, or indication of Meſſias.* Let Baſnage now, if he pleaſes, ſay, that *Logos* and *Mimra* are always applied by Jewiſh writers as a name for *God*; for if it be ſo, yet ſince it is here manifeſtly ſubſtituted as a title for the *Meſſiah*, the concluſion muſt be, that the Jews expected at leaſt ſomething *more than a human*, if not a *divine* ſalvation from the Meſſiah: And let others have recourſe to

* Accordingly the Venice edition from a different MS. of the Jeruſalem paraphraſe, inſtead of *per verbum tuum* has *per Meſſiam* here like that of Jonathan, which farther proves that thoſe titles were conſidered by the Jews as ſynonimous—and ſome tranſlators inſtead of *per verbum tuum* prefer *in verbo tuo*, but the ſenſe is plainly the ſame, *in* and εν in the Jewiſh provincial Greek of their ſcriptures being continually uſed to ſignify *by* or *through*, as in their vulgar tongue.

any

any other diſtinctions and evaſions whatever, by pretending that *Mimra* [Logos] means only *the ſpirit of God*, or *the word from God*, which the Meſſiah was to deliver; all this notwithſtanding it is ſtill equally clear, both in general that the appellation of *the word* was familiar among the Jews in *ſome ſenſe* or other in much *later* times than Chriſt as well as before, and alſo that it was ſometimes ſo applied by them in their Chaldee paraphraſes, as that the *body of the* Jews, who heard them read in the ſynagogues, immediately conceived, that the Meſſiah was meant or indicated by *Mimra*, i. e. *by the word*, or *your word*, or *the word of God*; and ſtill farther, that this *word* is generally ſpoken of there as an *exiſting perſon*, or *acting being*. Thus for example, *the word* is ſometimes ſaid in the Jeruſalem paraphraſe to *ſit* on his throne and *hear* men's prayers "*verbum* Domini *ſedet* ſuper thronum ſuum expectans et ſuſtinens et *audiens* preces omni tempore, quo nos oramus *coram eo*, et *facit* quod petimus." *Eſai.* 12. 3.—"*verbum* Domini regem vobis *conſtituiſtis* hodie, ut vobis *Deus* ſit." *Deut.* 26. 17.—"*Audi*, ô *verbum* Domini vocem precationis Judæ." *Deut.* 33. 7.—"*Verbum* Domini erat *demittens* ſuper illos

ſulphur et ignem à Jehova in cœlo." *Gen.* 19. 24. — " Hagar preces obtulit nomini *verbi* Dei, quòd ei *apparuit*."— " Recordatum eſt *verbum* Domini Rachelis" 30. — " Ei *obviam* venit *verbum* Domini è monte." *Exod.* 19. 3. Here we find not merely *ſpeech* but almoſt every perſonal action, paſſion and ſenſation aſcribed to the *Logos*; and ſhall any one now ſay, that theſe are only highly figurative expreſſions, by which the author did not *mean* to imply any perſonal agent? Be it ſo, but what his own *meaning* was does not ſo much concern us, as what he has *ſaid*, and what thereby the Jewiſh audience would *ſuppoſe* him to mean; and theſe would in their more blunt conceptions of courſe make realities out of figures, and *perſonal agents* out of *perſonified phraſes*; which would afterwards become a part of their popular theology. What the teachers therefore really *meant*, is a foreign queſtion, and we have no concern with any thing but what they have *ſaid* and what the body of the Jews would have *underſtood* them to mean by their words. It is to the plain conceptions of the unlearned *body* of the Jews, that Dr. P. himſelf has appealed, and not to the more obſcure *meaning* of ſome particular Jewiſh writers, ſuch as

as Philo and others, who, as he ſays, did not interpret the ſcriptures like the body of the people; but the above paſſages are the public interpretations read to the whole people in their ſynagogues.

Another example of a ſimilar kind occurs at Deutor. 32. v. 39, which is called the prophetic ſong of Moſes, "See now, that I, even I am He, and there is no God beſide me; I kill and I make alive again, I wound and I heal, neither is there any, that can deliver out of my hand:" This paſſage likewiſe the Jews have conſidered as prophetic of the days of the Meſſiah; and in general their traditions conſider all other ſalvations or redemptions to be only human and tranſitory except the laſt redemption by the Meſſiah which was to be eternal, and effected by God himſelf. Does not this ſufficiently prove, that it was to be in *ſome mode* or other divine? which ſuperhumanity or divinity of ſome kind or other both this paſſage and other Jewiſh opinions often apparently aſcribe to the Meſſiah himſelf. Accordingly the pretended Jonathan paraphraſes the above words thus, "Quando manifeſtabitur *verbum Jehovæ*, ut redimat populum ſuum, dicet ad omnes populos; videte nunc quia ego is ſum, qui fui et qui futurus ſum et non

non eſt Deus alius præter me: Ego *in vindicta mea* occido et vivificando vivifico populum domus Iſrael. Ego medeor illis in extremitate dierum." Theſe words *in the laſt days* are alone a ſufficient proof, that by *manifeſtabitur verbum Jehovæ* the author meant in the days of the Meſſiah; and ſo the body of the Jews likewiſe always underſtood them.* Hence (as Patrick informs us) R. Iſaac in his *Chiſſuk Emuna* alledges theſe words as a prophecy of the reſurrection of the dead in the days of the Meſſiah [*p.* 1. *cap.* 6. *ſect.* 20]. Here then we again find *verbum* employed in ſuch a manner, that it could not fail to be well known to the Jews as a ſubſtitute for the name of the Meſſiah.

It appears therefore hence, that although we may not be able to aſcertain preciſely, when the Jews *began* firſt to reprobate and deny the titles of *Logos* and *Son of God* for their Meſſiah (which was however probably in the firſt and ſecond

* The Jeruſalem paraphraſe interprets them in the ſame prophetic ſenſe "videte, quod jam ego *in verbo meo* ille ſum, neque eſt Deus alius præter me: ego ſum, qui vivos *in hoc ſeculo* interficio et *mortuos in futuro* reſuſcito."—Obſerve, that in the paſſage from Jonathan inſtead of *in vindictâ meâ* Patrick tranſlates *by my word*, query, why?

century,

century, out of oppoſition to ſuch Chriſtian expreſſions) yet that this was only done oſtenſibly in their converſations with the Greek Fathers, who from their ignorance of the provincial Chaldee could not convict thoſe Jews of falſehood: for notwithſtanding ſuch pretences and deception of the Greek Fathers, the Jews ſtill *retained* thoſe titles privately in their own interpretations of their ſcriptures read in their ſynagogues, and this down to 500 years after Chriſt and later; before which age Simon conceives the Jeruſalem paraphraſe not to have been compoſed; and the paraphraſe of the pretended Jonathan is apparently ſtill more modern. *

As to the philoſophical commentaries on the Old Teſtament, now called cabaliſtic, and which retain many *relics* of the ſame opinions and expreſſions concerning the Logos as are found in Philo and the

* "The Jeruſalem paraphraſe ſeems to have been compoſed later than the Talmud of Jeruſalem; for its ſtyle is more rude and barbarous even than this Talmud, which is itſelf writ in the barbarous tongue of Jeruſalem in that age, mixed with Perſian words as well as Greek and Latin." *Hiſt. crit. livr.* 2. *ch.* 18. —Origen ſays "I have often diſputed with the Jewiſh Rabbins; they would none of them acknowledge, that *the word* or *wiſdom* was the Son of God" [*cont. Cels. lib.* 1.]

popular theology of the Jews in the age of Chriſt, theſe are of ſtill later date apparently even than the above paraphraſes; and thereby prove ſtill further how ſlowly and gradually that popular theology and thoſe opinions and expreſſions concerning the Logos, current in the age of Chriſt, declined among the Jews in their own writings; of which they falſely denied all knowledge whatever to the Greek Chriſtians of the two firſt centuries.* But although M. Simon conceived theſe paraphraſes in their preſent form to be ſo modern, yet he allowed, "that they were probably collected from the memorandums of more antient celebrated Jewiſh doctors, whoſe names at length became unknown, yet ſome of them however are preſerved and quoted in the book's of ſeveral Rab-

* Baſnage himſelf allows, that this evidence from the paraphraſts "does not depend upon a ſingle paſſage; where the term *the word* may have ſlipt in by chance, but upon a great many verſes, and they aſcribe to it all the great events in the Old Teſtament," juſt as Philo and the firſt Greek Fathers do to the *Logos*— "it is impoſſible, that thoſe authors, who knew the Chriſtians called their Meſſiah *the word* would prefer this very term to expreſs the Deity by"—and thus while they oppoſed the divinity of Meſſiah, have given occaſion to ſay, they believed in a *Son of God*.

bins."

bins."* Thus the antiquity of the contents both of paraphraſes and cabaliſtic tracts is carried back to the age of Philo and Chriſt; and yet the *modern date* of their compilation is more uſeful to our argument than even the antiquity of their contents.

Hence then it follows, that the ſuggeſtion of Dr. Prieſtley, as if Baſnage had long ago diſproved all or any of my aſſertions and opinions, is altogether devoid of truth; for on the contrary Baſnage has confirmed the chief part of them: and in regard to the only two facts, in which we differ and which are not the moſt eſſential, viz. that the Jews in the New Teſtament diſcover no belief in the divinity of their Meſſiah; and that the term *Logos*,

* Hiſt. crit. ibid. How eaſily the Jews might conceal from the Greek Fathers the contents of theſe Chaldee paraphraſes will readily appear, if we conſider, that very few of them knew of the exiſtence of a Samaritan Pentateuch; and none of them, neither Origen, Jerom or Epiphanius, the only ones who underſtood any thing of Hebrew, manifeſt the leaſt knowledge of the exiſtence of any Chaldee paraphraſes: nay even the Jews themſelves until the laſt century could only affirm, that any ſuch paraphraſe, as that of a pretended Jonathan on the Pentateuch exiſted, they having never ſeen it; and one of the moſt learned of them *Elias Levita* ſo late as 1540 denied the exiſtence of any ſuch, until at length about 1590 it was printed at Venice by ſome Rabbins for their own uſe.

though well known (as he allows) to the body of the Jews, yet was not applied by them to the Meſſiah, theſe, I ſay, are not ſupported by Baſnage with ſufficient evidence, but are clearly enough contradicted by the evidence I have above produced. So that both the *idea* of a divine *Logos* and this *name* for the Meſſiah, as underſtood by St. John and the firſt Chriſtians, were apparently derived directly by them from the language and opinions of the Jewiſh ſynagogues; as Baſnage himſelf allows concerning the former, and the latter I have proved to be equally true. This chriſtian tenet therefore was not derived, as the Humanitarians pretend, either from the platonic Philo in particular or from any other Platonizing Jews of that age, and ſtill leſs from the writings of Plato himſelf directly, which St. John, a poor fiſherman, had probably never ſeen; and if he had, yet from none of them could he have borrowed this *name* and *idea* of a divine Logos except from that ſingle dialogue, *Timæus:* nay, not altogether even from that; for there the divine Logos is indeed conſidered as equal in power with the ſupreme Father and as ſecondary only in order; but never as a Meſſenger and Mediator between God and Man, who occaſionally deſcended from

from Heaven to be an agent on earth united to or reſident in a human being. This laſt article, if borrowed at all by the Chriſtians and not an original, could have been only copied by both Philo and St. John from the attributes and acts of the Logos aſcribed to him in the Jewiſh current theology, as appears by the Jewiſh book of wiſdom and their Chaldee paraphraſes. Now if this particular article was thus derived by the Chriſtians from the Jews, why alſo not all the reſt relative to the Logos and not from Platoniſm? and as Philo likewiſe muſt have drawn the ſame article from the Jews before himſelf, not from Plato, why not alſo from the ſame ſource all his other doctrines concerning the Logos? more eſpecially ſince they are all to be found in Jewiſh theology, ſuch as his divinity, mediatorſhip, pre-exiſtence before the creation, agency in the creation, and Meſſiahſhip. But as to the diſtant *origin* of ſuch doctrines among the Jews, whether they were taught to them ſolely by their own ſcriptures, from the agency aſcribed to *the word* and *wiſdom* in Geneſis, the Pſalms, Proverbs and Eccleſiaſticus; or whether they were borrowed from the Chaldeans or Egyptians, or any way introduced into Jewiſh theology directly

rectly from Platoniſm; this is a queſtion totally foreign from the other ſubject, if St. John knew nothing of ſuch derivation, but only employed and applied to the Chriſtian Meſſiah ſuch ideas and phraſes as he found naturalized and current among the body of the Jews, who had learned them from their authorized teachers in the ſynagogues: juſt as the populace in England daily employ pure Greek and Latin words, long naturalized here, though formerly frequent in Plato and Ariſtotle; yet without any knowledge or ſuſpicion of their high antiquity and learned deſcent. Now this was all that Le Clerc either in his *Bibl. univ.* or *notes* on St. John ever aſſerted on this ſubject of St. John's Platoniſm; and yet he has been miſrepreſented by Dr. Bull and others as if he accuſed St. John of introducing Platonic phraſes *directly* from Platoniſm. *Prim. Trad. c. 5. p.* 326. See it in part diſproved above, p. 71.

It muſt however be allowed, that it has not been ſolely Dr. Prieſtley and other modern Unitarians, who have made many ill-founded aſſertions concerning the *Logos*, but that others and even ſome orthodox writers have done the ſame; whereby they have undeſignedly contributed

buted to ſtrengthen the weak foundation of Unitarianiſm; for the abettors of it are ever ready to call in the authority, opinions and errors of abler writers to ſupport and countenance their own errors. We have already ſeen this verified by Dr. P. in regard to Baſnage a ſuppoſed orthodox author; and from whom I ſhould have rather ſuſpected that Dr. P. would have accuſed me of *retailing* my own opinions, than that Baſnage had *refuted* mine. Now what Baſnage erroneouſly affirmed concerning the Jews, that they never applied the appellation of *the word* to their Meſſiah, but to the Deity only, Mr. Nye had long ago affirmed the ſame error concerning Philo; who, as he pretends "never ſays or intimates that the *Logos* is or is to be the Meſſias."* Mr. Nye was not a decided Unitarian, nor yet orthodox, but he has ſtarted many arguments of which the Unitarians have made uſe, and he has made ſeveral erroneous aſſertions, in which they have blindly followed him, as Dr. P. has done accordingly in this particular article. ‡ Mangey however was truly orthodox, and yet he has fallen into the ſame error with Nye and Dr. P; ſo very contagious are

* Doctrine of Trinity, p. 77. 1701. — See alſo above, p. 52 and 59.—‡ See above, p. 59.

falſe aſſertions!* But I have diſproved that aſſertion by one example at p. 52, notwithſtanding that Philo is ſo very cautious not to mention any thing concerning the Meſſiah, except in a very indirect way: Le Clerc likewiſe was apparently ſenſible of the ſame truth with myſelf, when he obſerved "that Philo had applied to the Logos many prophetic paſſages of the Old Teſtament, which the Apoſtles apply to Chriſt, and he had given to the Logos the chief part of thoſe very titles of the Meſſiah employed by [both Jews] and Chriſtians."† Now can we conceive it poſſible, that the Jews would have borne even in Philo, that he ſhould apply to the *Logos*, if conſidered by them as merely a Platonic Deity, thoſe prophecies and titles, by which they denoted their own expected Meſſiah? He would have been abominated as a prophaner of the Jewiſh religion, unleſs they had themſelves been equally well accuſtomed with Philo to conſider their Meſſiah under the name and idea of a divine Logos. This fact alone ſeems to

* "Licet plurimas divinitatis notas *verbo* tribuat Philo, ejus tamen perſonam eandem fore cum Meſſiâ nunquam, ut mihi videtur, docuit." *Præfat. ad Philonem.*

† Biblioth. Univ. tom. 10. p. 402.

me

me ſtrongly to prove the univerſality among the Jews of the practice of conſidering the Logos as the expected Meſſiah; and that whenceſoever this practice had its *origin* among them, whether ſolely from their own ſcriptures, or from Chaldaiſm, Egyptianiſm or Platoniſm, yet that it had long been eſtabliſhed before Chriſt: ſo that St. John only followed the example of all other Jews, when he enumerated *the Logos* among other common titles of the Meſſiah in his firſt chapter, ſuch as *the light, the life, he that ſhall come, the beginning, the firſt born of the father, the meſſenger from God, that prophet*, &c; thereby he meant to ſhew, that as Jeſus was that *meſſenger* from God, who was entitled to thoſe *titles*, who had appeared in thoſe *characters*, and performed thoſe *acts*, which the whole body of Jews expected in the Meſſiah, conſequently Jeſus was that very expected Meſſiah or Chriſt.*

* We may hence perceive to what a weak argument Mr. Lindſey has had recourſe to ſupport his interpretation of *Logos* in John, as meaning the attribute of *reaſon only*. "It is an additional proof, that Logos is by no means a *name* of Chriſt, becauſe the Evangeliſt never after gives him that name," *Vindic. Prieſtl. p.* 43.—It is a much ſtronger proof, that Logos *was* a name for the Meſſiah, becauſe it is there enumerated among ſo many other Jewiſh names of him.

But although Mangey has fallen into an error in this ſingle article, which is favorable to the wiſhes of the Unitarians, yet in that other material one, that Philo as well as St. John drew all their knowledge of the Logos from the current Jewiſh theology, in this Mangey agrees with Bull, Allix, Le Clerc and myſelf, and all of them with Baſnage*; ſo far has Baſnage been from refuting or even contradicting any of thoſe authors in this matter! Where is the advantage of philoſophy or metaphyſics to Dr. Prieſtley and other Unitarians, if it does not teach them to diſtinguiſh what is true or not, and to repreſent it accordingly? The only differences among theſe writers are concerning the *origin* of the above article of Jewiſh theology, and concerning the *degree of* Platoniſm imputable to Philo, in which they have all in their turns fallen

* Sit ergo ratum, Philonem non ita penitus Platoni addictum — ut *unquam* à ſacris ſcripturis, niſi ubi illæ filere videntur, diſcedere. Doctrina de *Logo* nunnullis videtur Platoniſmi meri indicium, cæterum auſim affirmare eam non è gentili philoſophia, verum ex Hebræorum libris effluxiſſe — paraphraſes chaldaicæ manifeſto ſunt indicio Philonem non novum de *Logo* dogma protuliſſe — dico igitur audacter Philonem et paraphraſtas Hebræos non extrinſecus ſed ex *ſuæ gentis placitis* fuiſſe eruditos et *publicè* recepta patrum ſuorum traditione." *Præfat. ad Philonem.*

into

into ſome miſtakes; but which however I ſhall not at preſent conſider any farther, than juſt to obſerve in general, that although Philo had recourſe to Jewiſh theology for the *origin* of his doctrine of the *Logos*, yet he certainly embelliſhed and trimmed it up after the model of Plato. This would give no offence to the Jews of that age, who like the firſt Greek Chriſtians ſoon after, had frequent recourſe to Plato's philoſophy as a ſhield to defend their own religious opinions from the accuſations of atheiſm and impiety made againſt them by the heathens; by their being able to ſhew, that Plato, the general favorite of thoſe heathens themſelves held nearly the ſame opinions concerning the Deity with the Jews: and this it was, which brought Platoniſm to be ſo favorably thought of by the Jews before Chriſt, juſt as it was by the firſt Greek Chriſtians afterwards for the ſame reaſon. The miſtake therefore of the Unitarians conſiſts in their converting this ſhield of defence, borrowed ſucceſſively by the Jews and Chriſtians to vindicate their own religious tenets, into the firſt ſource and *origin* of thoſe tenets among the Chriſtians; who were in theſe tenets and in this conduct mere copieſts after the Jews. But indeed with reſpect

to the Jews themſelves it may admit of ſome doubt, whether, on account of thoſe few paſſages in Geneſis, the Pſalms, and Proverbs concerning the *word of God* and *wiſdom*, they would have ever thought of adopting the former appellation for *every kind* of divine agency in their ſcriptures, in caſe they had not firſt read of a ſimilar *character* and the *operations* of the *divine Logos* in Plato; and thought that the high reputation and ſimilarity of Plato's philoſophy would become both an explanation of and recommendation to the accounts of divine agency contained in their own ſcriptures. It is however poſſible, that we might be able to have traced the name and idea of *divine Logos* among the Jews from a more early *origin*, namely, from Chaldaiſm, in caſe we had any genuine relics now preſerved of Chaldæan philoſophy*: accord-

* If what Stanley and afterwards Le Clerc have publiſhed under the title of *Chaldaica Oracula* be genuine, we need not to regret, that Chaldæan philoſophy has periſhed: But it ſeems more probable, that they are only relics of the myſtical gibberiſh of oriental or Egyptian gnoſtics. Accordingly Baronius [annal. tom. 2. ad A. C. 120.] obſerves from Porphyry "gnoſticos Romæ edidiſſe libros ſub *Revelationum Zoroaſtris* titulo;" which is the very title of thoſe abovementioned, τα του Ζωροαστρου Λογια, and it is wonderful, that able authors can make a ſerious reference to them for evidence. See above note to p. 72.

ingly

ingly the author of the tract *Philoſophoumena* aſcribed to Origen, produces an account of a ſimilar tenet of a divine Logos ſubſiſting among the Brachmans in India; but whether he was miſinformed, or confounded them with the Chaldæans, or whether being a Chriſtian he was fond of extending Chriſtian doctrines to more early ages, through a miſguided notion of finding Chriſtianity as old as the creation, theſe are queſtions, which I cannot reſolve*. But whatever was at firſt the *origin* of this tenet among the Jews, whether derived from their own ſcriptures or by tradition from ſome of their prophets, or from the ſame common oriental ſource, whence Anaxagoras & Timæus derived their own philoſophy, which was embelliſhed by Plato;† yet it certainly received afterwards

* "Hi dicunt Deum eſſe *lumen* (φῶς) non ſicut ſol vel ignis, ſed eſt Deus illis *verbum* [Λογος] non articulatum ſed illud cognitionis, cujus ope occulta notitiæ myſteria cernuntur à ſapientibus." *c.* 24. The Jews might borrow the name of *light* for God and the Meſſiah from the ſame oriental ſource. In another tract on the Bracmanni publiſhed by Biſſæus with Palladius p. 94, they ſay "verbum eſt Deus, hoc mundum creavit."

† To the diſcredit of Philoſophy it muſt be confeſſed that Thales and other firſt Greek philoſophers were rank Materialiſts, although Cudworth has in vain attempted to whitewaſh them; for they allowed

of

a tinge from Platoniſm during the 300 years of the Greek kingdoms in Syria before Chriſt, as appears clearly from Philo's doctrine on this ſubject.*

of nothing exiſting originally except a chaotic maſs, and that divine intellect or reaſon was only the firſt element, which emerged and diſengaged itſelf from the chaos, after which it gave its aſſiſtance to the others and thus formed the univerſe. But Anaxagoras afterwards added *divine intellect* as ſubſiſting originally along with the chaotic maſs, and as employing its *reaſon* to diſengage the material elements and produce the world; in this he was followed by Timæus and Plato. The Greek philoſophers merely as world-makers are alone ſufficient to make all reaſonable men quite ſick of the quackery of philoſophy, even without the addition of Dr. Prieſtley's metaphyſics; yet at leaſt they were not unfaithful in their profeſſed *love of truth* although they were very chimerical in the purſuit of it.

* It does not appear from Laertius, that Anaxagoras perſonified the divine Logos, neither has Timæus done ſo in his tract ſtill extant; he only ſays Νουν αιτιαν ειναι των κατα Λογον γιγνομενων, θεοντε ονυμαι γεςθαι. Dr. P. thinks, that Plato ſometimes did perſonify the Logos, at other times not ſo. In this he was imitated by Philo, who ſometimes mentions the *Logos* in the Arian character of a ſubordinate divine Being, yet at other times as the eternal attribute of *reaſon* in the Deity: but none of thoſe heathens made a *meſſenger* and *mediator* of the Logos; this Philo took altogether from Jewiſh theology, but tinged it with Platoniſm, yet he did not alter its eſſence; or as Huetius expreſſes the ſame fact *Philo in Platonis ludum Judaica dogmata intulit.* Alnet. queſtion. p. 127.

If

If then through theſe means ſome Platonic ideas as well as phraſes had deſcended circuitouſly and indirectly into Chriſtianity through Jewiſh theology, and unknown to the firſt unlearned Chriſtians themſelves (as Le Clerc had long ago ſuggeſted) this might have been cenſured as a defect in orthodoxy, in caſe thoſe exotic tinges had not been removed by the later Chriſtians; but this will not excuſe Dr. P. as an *hiſtorian* for his error in miſtaking this article of antiquity ſo much; nor yet as a candid *Chriſtian* for unjuſtly accuſing Juſtin and his cotemporaries a whole century after Chriſt, of then firſt introducing as an innovation in Chriſtianity, opinions and expreſſions, which had ſubſiſted in it from its infancy; and had been ſucked in by the Greek diſciples with the firſt milk of inſtruction from the Jewiſh Chriſtians their tutors, and from the current Jewiſh theology of that age. Dr. Prieſtley's miſtake is of the ſame nature as if he had maintained, that all Greek and Latin words now commonly current in the Engliſh language were adopted into it ſince the revival of learning in the laſt two centuries and *directly* from Greek and Latin; altho' the real fact is, that the chief part of ſuch words were brought here by the Normans, who

had borrowed them from the Franks in Gaul, and they borrowed them from the provincial Latin ſpoken by the Gauls; who had borrowed them from the Romans, and the Romans had borrowed ſome of them directly from Greece, and others they had brought with them, when the roving tribes of Greek Pelaſgi firſt came and ſettled in Italy. Thoſe opinions and phraſes of the firſt Chriſtians, which Dr. P. calls Platonic, ſeem to have taken almoſt as long and *circuitous* a journey through the land of Judæa into the mouths of the firſt Greek Chriſtians.

Upon the whole then, inſtead of Baſnage being a *counter evidence* againſt any thing aſſerted by me in my foregoing *Remarks*, or even againſt Cudworth, Allix and Bull, in regard to any articles, in which I have agreed with their opinions, I might on the contrary (notwithſtanding Baſnage's miſtakes in the above-mentioned two articles) have with propriety ſubjoined his name to thoſe of Whitby, Pocock, Selden, Bull and others, enumerated by me at p. 70 as *modern evidence* to the *exiſtence*, among the Jews in the age of Chriſt, of a popular theology, wherein the *idea* and *name* of a divine Logos ſubſiſted as a religious opinion relative to the Meſſiah; whether it

was

was *at firſt* borrowed by the Jews from Platoniſm, or Platoniſm from them, or ſolely from their own ſcriptures, or from ſome common oriental ſource: for it is not the *origin* of that opinion for which I have any where contended; but only the facts of the *exiſtence* of it, and that from thence was derived all the knowledge which St. John and other firſt Chriſtians had concerning that *appellation* and *character* of the Chriſt. Why then do the Unitarians thus go on to introduce confuſion into *hiſtory* and *antiquity*, if they pay that regard to *truth* which they ſo repeatedly profeſs? It were indeed to be wiſhed that they would read more attentively, reaſon more accurately, and write leſs confidently in their philoſophic romances, which they are pleaſed to miſcall rational ſyſtems of Chriſtianity; but which, if not leſs conſiſtent with reaſon than orthodox ſyſtems of it, are at leaſt totally inconſiſtent with hiſtory, antiquity, juſt criticiſm, faithful quotation, and concluſive reaſoning, in all which articles we find both Dr. P. and his aſſociates continually deficient. Such then is philoſophy, ſuch is Unitarian accuracy in hiſtory, ſuch their love of truth and the foundation of their rational

Chriſtianity, all ſo vaſtly ſuperior to orthodoxy!

Now if the fact be thus, that Philo did not borrow from Plato his doctrine of the divine Logos and other theologic opinions, but derived them immediately from the current theology of his own nation, a difficulty may occur to readers how the antients, both Heathens and Chriſtians, came to ſpeak of Philo as being almoſt a ſecond Plato. Here it ſhould be conſidered, that this current expreſſion does not neceſſarily imply, that they conceived Philo to be a *copiſt* from Plato, and thus that it referred to the *origin* of the reſemblance between them; but only to the *fact* itſelf, that there was a ſtrong reſemblance between the two authors, without entering into the queſtion how that reſemblance happened. and beſides this, ſo very vague is the expreſſion, that even now it is not agreed among writers in what that reſemblance alluded to, conſiſts. It is not in *diction*, ſay ſome; for there is a formal ſtiffneſs and affected turgidneſs in Philo's diction, very unlike to the eaſy mellifluous elegance of Plato: it is not, even in *opinions*, ſay others*; while Le Clerc on the contrary

* "A *dictione* Platonis libri Philonis longius fortaſſe diſſident, quam in *doctrina*, etſi in dictione quo-

attempts to prove, that Philo borrowed *every thing* from Plato, juſt as the antient Greeks pretended to diſcover in Homer the origin of all arts and ſciences*. For Le Clerc, and after him Fabricius, and alſo Mangey in ſome reſpect, have run to ſuch exceſs, as to ſuppoſe Philo to have borrowed from Plato even all ſuch opinions, as he might juſt as well have borrowed from many Greek poets, or from ſeveral other Greek philoſophers, nay, which he might have equally borrowed from the popular theology and vulgar diſcourſes of every Greek nation around him. I may here then apply the words of Le Clerc himſelf upon another occaſion, that he might as well attempt to perſuade us, that Philo learned to cough and ſpit from Plato. Accordingly Fabricius ſaw enough of theſe oppoſite exceſſes to endeavor at leaſt to ſteer a medium between them, yet he has not kept ſufficiently clear of the errors of

que et in verbis eum non raro Platonizat." *Fabricius de Platoniſmo Philonis. Sect.* 8.

"Superſtites libri Philonis platonicum *genium* non ſpirant, neque Joſephus platonicam ejus *eruditionem* novit." *Jonſius Hiſt. Philoſoph.* 2. 4.

* Epiſtol. critic 8.—Dupin, on the contrary, ſeems to judge, that Philo had the name of ſecond Plato on account of his ſtyle. "Il imite ſi bien le ſtile de Platon." *Diſſ. prel.* 2. 6.

Le Clerc as above-mentioned: conſequently he has not accurately ſtated what *reſemblance* between the doctrine of Philo and Plato *accidentally* ſubſiſted before the age of Philo, and what additions were intentionally made to it by Philo himſelf directly from Plato; theſe additions ſeem to have been only in a few ſuperadded *circumſtances* and *expreſſions*, but not in the *ſubſtance* of any of Philo's theologic opinions. The ſubſtance itſelf of his doctrine he derived from the current theology of the Jews; but he attempted to recommend it ſtill more to the Greeks, who were prejudiced againſt Judaiſm, by ſhewing how conformable it was to Plato's theology, the idol of the Greeks themſelves: and for this purpoſe he aſſimilated the two ſtill more than originally, by dreſſing out Jewiſh tenets after the model and in the garb of Platoniſm; by cloathing them in thoſe characters, ideas and expreſſions with which ſuch ſimilar tenets were exhibited in Plato himſelf, particularly in regard to the creation and divine Logos. The ſubſtance of theſe doctrines ſubſiſted before in Jewiſh theology (however they were introduced) but Philo dreſſed them out with all Plato's more *peculiar* notions of them,

them, ſuch as that mental *ideas* of material objects had been exiſting *ſubſtances* from eternity, and the original patterns after which material objects were faſhioned; a doctrine which Ariſtotle refuted, whereby he gave the firſt ſketch of Locke's ſyſtem, that material objects exiſted firſt, and that all our *ideas* have been ultimately derived from them by ſenſation, ſo that material objects are rather the patterns of ideas. Hence Le Clerc and others have erroneouſly concluded, that Philo borrowed the *ſubſtance* of the doctrine of the Logos from Plato as well as theſe ſuperadded *circumſtances*; becauſe Philo, like Plato, makes the divine Logos to be the *image* of God, and the agent who formed material objects after thoſe ideal patterns from eternity, which were produced by the energy of the paternal intellect. But in fact it is ſolely in regard to this new dreſs, which Philo gave to an older doctrine, that Le Clerc, Fabricius and Mangey have been able to prove that Philo borrowed *any thing* at all from Plato; all his other imputed thefts might (as I obſerved before) be juſt as well borrowed (if borrowed at all) from almoſt any Greek poet and philoſopher, or from popular Greek opinions*.

opinions*. Thus Philo finding various opinions in Jewiſh theology concerning the Deity, the creation and a divine Logos as an agent of the Deity, which reſembled the theology of Plato, he brought them to a ſtill greater reſemblance than originally by adopting various additional Platonic *circumſtances*; and then he put a force upon the words of the Jewiſh ſcriptures in order to make them countenance thoſe Platonic *additions* as well as the real *ſubſtance* of the Jewiſh doctrines themſelves†. It is certain however that there was originally a real ſimilitude between the theology of the Jews and of Plato, (whenceſoever it aroſe) but poſſibly becauſe they both had copied ſome of their opinions from a common oriental ſource, either Jewiſh ſcripture or Egyptian philoſophy, or ſome other‡: and the notion of Le Clerc and other moderns, that Philo borrowed every thing from Plato, where there is the leaſt

* De Platoniſmo Philonis inter opuſc. Fabricii. Hamburg. 1738. p. 150.—Mangei Præfat in Philonem.

† "Que a Platone hauſerat Philo, ea verbis Moſis confirmavit, quaſi eſſet Moſaica doctrina, ut vidimus circa *ideas*." *Clericus Epiſt.* 8.

‡ "Ex *eodem fonte* et Plato et Philo [et Judæi] dogmata ſua hauſere, quod et agnovit Gelenius in prefatione ad Philonem." *Sandius.*

reſemblance,

reſemblance, is juſt as unſolid as that of the antient Jews, that Plato borrowed all from Moſes. For in fact Anaxagoras and Timæus were the immediate originals, from whom Plato derived his own theology and account of the creation and divine Logos, nay, even his doctrine of *ideas* likewiſe, as the work of Timæus ſtill extant, ſufficiently proves; although Plato has indeed augmented and much embelliſhed it by the aid of his new method of philoſophic oratory and poetic proſe. But that neither of theſe earlier Greek philoſophers, nor yet Thales before them, had recourſe to more antient Aſiatic and oriental philoſophy to aſſiſt their own invention at coſmogony, is no way probable, when we find that a *chaotic maſs* was the foundation of all their philoſophic theology; the very name of which betrays its barbaric origin in Heſiod and the firſt Greek poets: and although the firſt Greek philoſophers Thales, Anaxagoras and Timæus did not retain the name, yet they retained the ſame doctrine a little varied under different appellations. For what is the *infinitum* out of which Thales made the gods, men and all things to be produced, except the chaos of Heſiod, out of which both divine and material objects were generated?

nerated? Accordingly Plutarch ſays, that *infinitum nihil aliud eſt niſi materia*; which *infinite expanſe of matter* Thales conſidered as having moſt reſemblance to *water*, and Anaxagoras to *air*. Timæus adds "Quum Deus videret materiam alterari variè quidem, ſed tamen inordinatè, eam ipſe in ordinem reduxit, et ex indefinitis mutationibus in certam quandam conſtituit, ut non temère viciſſitudines ultro citroque reciperet; mundum igitur creavit Deus ex *omnigenâ materia**." Anaxagoras had retained the ſame doctrine "Olim omnes res mundanæ ſimul erant inconditæ deinde acceſſit mens (divina) eas que ordinavit†." What is this account in either Greek philoſopher but the chaos of Moſes and Ovid? It is evident then that the coſmogony of the earlieſt Greek philoſophers was both an exotic doctrine, either Egyptian or Oriental, and that there was an original ſimilitude between that and the theology of Moſes long before Philo the Jew ſtudied Plato, who in fact had invented nothing eſſentially new in it, but only modified it in his own way, juſt as Thales,

* Εξ απασας τας ὑλας. Timæus de anima mundi. Edit. Gale.

† Diog. Laert. in Anaxagora. Παντα ὁμου τεταγμενα ἀρροθεν. The Egyptians ſaid the ſame. *Laert. Proem.*

Anaxagoras

Anaxagoras and Timæus, from whom he borrowed his account, had done before him: and Philo in a ſtill later age only dreſſed out the original account of Moſes on this and other ſubjects in this newer garb of Plato, rather than of the Greek philoſophers who preceded him; but the fundamental doctrines themſelves of Philo were originally Jewiſh ones, the *ſubſtance* of them alſo ſtill remained in Philo unaltered, and were not borrowed by him from Plato at all; but only, as above-mentioned, *circumſtances* were ſuperadded, together with a few Platonic *expreſſions*, as Fabricius has rightly obſerved in a foregoing note. A ſimilar caſe occurred in more modern times, when Maimonides dreſſed up Judaiſm as much in the garb of Ariſtoteliſm, as Philo had done before in that of Platoniſm, yet ſtill without altering the chief tenets of Jewiſh theology, as I may have occaſion afterwards to point out more minutely*.

* If the orthodox Mr. Parkhurſt had well attended to this, I ſee no reaſon why he ſhould think Philo *ſuch a ſtrange mortal, half Jew and half Pagan Platoniſt (Pre-exiſtence, &c. p. 32)*. What is there more ſtrange in Philo's being a Platoniſt in his age, than in Maimonides being an Ariſtotelian in the 12th century;

I have ſtill to obſerve farther with reſpect to the nature of Philo's Platoniſm concerning the Logos, that ſome authors, who allow the familiar uſe of that appellation among the Jews before the age of Philo, ſeem nevertheleſs to think, that the following diſtinction ought to be made; namely, that the Chaldee word *Mimra* (the *Word)* was chiefly in popular uſe among the Jews, and that the Greek term *Logos* was in little uſe except among the learned and philoſophic part of the Jews. If this were the real fact, we ſhould hence be at loſs *how* it came to be ſo well known to St. John, a poor fiſherman. But this diſtinction does not appear to me well founded; the chief difference in the uſe of the two appellations was rather of a *national* than a *philoſophic* nature. The Alexandrian and Helleniſtic Jews, who generally ſpoke Greek, and had almoſt loſt all knowledge of their vulgar Chaldee as well as Hebrew language, theſe probably were in the habit of better comprehending and more frequently employing the word *Logos*, as being the proper Greek word for *Mimra*;

tury; and the doctrines of the latter are more disfigured by Ariſtotelian phraſes and ideas than Philo is by thoſe of Plato.

while

while on the contrary, by the Jews in Judæa, *Mimra* would be naturally in moſt frequent uſe, as their vulgar dialect was provincial Chaldee, although indeed many of them ſpoke Greek, and thoſe who did ſo, would in courſe employ *Logos* like St. John. Accordingly that Logos was in popular uſe among the Jews, at leaſt in Egypt, we have poſitive teſtimony for it from Philo himſelf, who ſays, "He that follows God ſhall have for companions the angels, vulgarly called *Logoi.*' [ὐς ονομαζουσι Λογους*]. Yet this word in this ſenſe does not ſeem to have been confined to the Jews, but to have been employed alſo by the Greeks themſelves, at leaſt by thoſe in Egypt: for Plutarch, when treating of Egyptian theology, employs *Logos* to mean *an emanation, repreſentation* or *ſenſible appearance* of the divine nature; and Philo in like manner conſiders angels to be *viſible repreſentatives* and *appearances* of the Deity. It could not fail therefore to become a vulgar *national* term among the

* I give this in the tranſlation of Mr. Nye, who obſerves upon it, "It appears hence, that the Jews were generally wont to call the angels *Logoi.*" Perhaps he ſhould have rather ſaid *the Jews in Egypt, who ſpoke Greek.* *Doctrine of Trinity, p.* 75 *and* 134, where he again aſcribes this *to the whole Jewiſh nation.*

Helleniſtic Jews to expreſs the Chaldee word *Mimra*, and from them it would in courſe be transferred to ſuch Jews in Judæa as ſpoke Greek*.

But there is another ſubject of doubt, which requires to be removed, namely, to aſcertain more preciſely, that thoſe two other witneſſes to the currency of *Logos* among the Jews, *Philo* and the author of the *Book of Wiſdom*, wrote before Chriſtianity was known beyond Judæa. The evidence indeed for that word ariſing from the Chaldee paraphraſes is equally if not more ſtrong, although they ſhould have been compiled *later* than the prevalence of Chriſtianity; but it is otherwiſe with reſpect to the two afore-mentioned witneſſes;

* The words of Plutarch are Οι μεν γαρ εν ουρανω και αστροις Λογοι και ειδη και απορροιαι του θεου μενουσι "The *ſenſible appearances*, and *forms* and *emanations* of a god in the heavens and heavenly bodies remain permanent, while thoſe diſperſed about the earth and ſea, and other material objects, periſh and are buried, yet often riſe forth to light again and appear once more to mankind." *De Iſid. & Oſiride.* Plutarch is ſpeaking of the diſperſed members of Oſiris, which were ſuppoſed by the Egyptians to have been collected and buried. Philo ſometimes employs λογος, ειδη and απορροια nearly in the ſame ſenſe with λογος here in Plutarch, as when he calls manna a *Logos*, and elſewhere he ſays, that good thoughts are *Logoi*, i. e. emanations from God. *Nye's Trinity, p. 74 and 76.*

for

for if they lived later than Chriſtianity, it may be ſaid, that they borrowed their knowledge and uſe of Logos from the Chriſtians, which could not have been the fact in regard to the Chaldee paraphraſes.

Now with reſpect to Philo, ſuch teſtimony has been adduced by *Allix*, that he was an *old grey-headed* man, when he went ambaſſador to Caligula in the year 40, that all writers, both at home and in foreign countries, have been hitherto perfectly convinced of that fact; and conſequently, that he could not have drawn his uſe of the word Logos from the tenets of the Chriſtians, as the chief part of his theologic works were by his own confeſſion compoſed in his *youth* [ἡ πρωτη ἡλικια. *de Leg. Spec.*] therefore before the appearance of Chriſt, or within ten years after his death. Accordingly, at p. 42, I have mentioned this as a matter of certainty, which I did not ſuſpect to be ever called in queſtion; and in this Baſnage again perfectly agrees with Allix and myſelf, as may be ſeen in the quotation from him in note to p. 108: nevertheleſs it is now proper to aſcertain the fact in a ſtill clearer manner; for if Philo had flouriſhed *ſo late* as to be able to acquire a knowledge of Chriſtianity, as ſome of the Greek fathers

have related, the evidence ariſing from his works, although not annihilated, yet would be conſiderably diminiſhed. It would not be annihilated, becauſe if he had learned his uſe of Logos from the Chriſtians, it could have appeared only in a few of his lateſt works written in his old age; whereas in fact it runs ſo uniformly through almoſt all his tracts, that it muſt have been familiar to him in his *youth* when he applied to philoſophy; and Jewiſh theology is what both he and Joſephus always mean by philoſophy. But Philo's evidence would certainly become the more indubitable, in caſe he was a grey-headed old man ſo early as the year 40; for then, as Baſnage expreſſes the caſe, "Philo muſt have ſpoken of the Logos in his youth a long time before he travelled to Rome in the year 40," and longer ſtill before he could have converſed with St. Peter there and turned Chriſtian, as the fathers relate and even ſome moderns believe: for this could not have been before the year 55, in which Nero began his reign, during whoſe reign St. Peter is ſaid to have come to Rome; nor yet later than 64, about which year Nero's perſecution of the Chriſtians took place, in which

which St. Peter is ſaid to have periſhed*. I ſhall therefore clearly ſtate the chief of Allix's arguments on the ſubject, and confirm the validity of them†.

* Le Clerc indeed has ſaid, that "Philo a vecu peu de tems *après* Jeſus Chriſt." *Bibl. Univ.* 10. *p.* 399. This is ſtrictly true, as he was alive in the year 40; but Le Clerc did not mean to aſſert, but that his writings were compoſed in his youth, and that this was long *before* Chriſt.

† "One muſt have a ſtrong imagination to fancy, that Philo, if a Chriſtian, could write, as he does, upon moſt parts of the Books of Moſes without mixing ſome touches at leaſt at the Chriſtian religion; and yet there is no ſuch thing in all Philo's works. He takes it for his buſineſs to make the Jews underſtand their law in an allegorical way, and to teach the Heathens, that their prejudices againſt it were unjuſt. This is the deſign of the Author in all his works: in all of them there is nothing peculiar to Chriſt, except it be in what is written of the *Logos*. Yet even that doth not hinder, but that the Jews finding every thing in Philo ſo agreeable to the notions, that their anceſtors had in his age, do own them to be the writings of a Jew, and of Philo in particular: not only all antient Jewiſh authors, but alſo that later one *Manaſſeh Ben Iſrael*, in many places alledges his authority, and ſhews that his opinions do generally agree with thoſe of their moſt antient authors.—Beſides, it appears by Philo's books themſelves, that many of them actually were compoſed *before* Jeſus began to preach the goſpel in the 29th of the vulgar æra. For in his *quod omnis probus ſit liber*, he ſays. "that the obſtinate reſiſtance of the citizens of Xanthus in Lycia againſt M. Brutus was freſh in memory, as having happened *not a great while ago* [ϰ προ πολλου]. Now this event muſt have taken

In this firſt proof Allix is neither fair nor concluſive. The original ſays nothing about the event in queſtion, being *freſh in the memory* but only *not very long ſince*, which is ſo vague a phraſe as cannot decide whether he was an old man in the year 40 or not until 40 years later; and at any rate the event happened before Philo was born, even although he was a grey-headed man of 70 ſo early as at his embaſſy in the year 40. It has therefore been properly obſerved, that by ου προ πολλου Philo meant only to make an oppoſition between this *modern* example taken from the hiſtory of that *age*, and ſome very *antient* ones adduced by him before almoſt from fabulous hiſtory, and both produced to confirm one and the ſame truth*.

taken place *after* the death of Julius Cæſar in the 44th year before the vulgar æra, and *before* the 42d, in which M. Brutus died, therefore 82 years before Philo's embaſſy to Caligula in the 40th year of Chriſt, at which time he confeſſes himſelf to be a *grey-headed old* man. But could any one ſay, that a thing happened *not very long ſince*, which happened before the remembrance of any man then living?" *Allix's Judgment of Jewiſh Church*, p. 77.

* Αλλα γαρ και δημους ὁλους ακουομεν ὑπερ ελευθεριας—παγωλεθριαν ὑποσταντας, ὡσπερ φασιν ου προ πολλου Ξανθικους, επειδη γαρ εις των επιθεμενων Ιουλιῳ καισαρι, Βρουτος μαι επιων επ' αυλους εσρατευσε, απεμαχονλο.

But

But another proof is more ſolid, and has accordingly been deemed ſo by Mangey and foreigners*. The only doubt here is whether Philo meant to ſay, that he was *grey* when his embaſſy took place in the year 40, or at a *later* time, when he wrote the account of it in that tract entitled Περι Αρετων η πρεσβεια προς Καιον wherein he mentions this circumſtance of his old age. Now though it is *poſſible*, that the tract might be written *much later* than the event, yet that he ſhould defer it for 40 years ſeems incredible; but he muſt have done ſo, if he was only 30 at the time of his

* "Philo's embaſſy to Caligula was in the year 40, and in his hiſtory of this legation he ſays of himſelf, that he was at that time all grey with age, that is, 70 years old according to the Jewiſh notion of a man with grey hair (*for which ſee Pirke Avoth, c. 5.*)" Allix. p. 80.

Philo begins this tract with theſe words, "Quo uſque tandem *nos ſenes* erimus pueri, corpore quidem per ætatem *cani*, animo vero propter imperitiam infantes, ut qui fortunam putamus ſtabilem."

Αχρι τινος ἡμεις οἱ γεροντες ετι παιδες ἐσμεν τα μεν σωματα χρονου μηκει πολιοι, τα δε ψυχας, &c. Now I cannot but think, that the firſt words *quo uſque*, by having reſpect to *length of time*, imply, that the writer was *old* before the *event* of that change of fortune cauſed by Caligula's ill conduct; and that the whole reflexion would be ὑστερον προτερον, in caſe the *event* had preceeded his *old age*; of which therefore there ſhould be proof before it be ſuppoſed.

embaſſy, as ſome ſuppoſe, and was yet *grey* when he wrote that tract; neither are there any circumſtances contained in the tract, which give the leaſt room for any ſuppoſition at all of its being *writ* much later than the event related in it: nay, on the contrary, they all conſpire to confirm that it was writ *immediately* after the event, either during the life of Caligula, who was murdered in January in the very next year 41, or at lateſt in the beginning of the ſubſequent reign of Claudius; and, as Suetonius ſhews, Caligula's death was within four months after Philo's interview in the year 40. Why then ſhould we *ſuppoſe* it to have been writ 40 years, or any conſiderable time after the event, if there be no proof nor even any indication of ſuch a delay? Moreover, the Jews having been greatly oppreſſed by Flaccus, Governor at Alexandria, who was ſlain however by Caligula about the year 38; and they being ſtill oppreſſed by Caligula until the year 40, it was an intereſting ſubject to the Jews for Philo to give a minute account of the tranſactions of *both* thoſe perſons at the very time they happened, or ſoon after; but *both* would become antiquated tales 40 years afterwards, when ſix new emperors had been upon the throne, and a civil war had

had cauſed many total revolutions among the Romans. Philo again, both begins and ends his tract with pointing out the cauſe of the animoſity of Caligula againſt the Jews; but who would want to know this 40 years afterwards, when the whole had become an old ſtory, and ſo many new tragedies had been acted in the Roman world? The tract ſtill farther was entitled *De Virtutibus*; and Philo mentions in the body of it, that his view therein was to point out the different effects of *virtues* and *vices*, by ſhewing how Caligula by his *vices* had in four years nearly ruined that favorable ſtate of the Roman empire, in which Tiberius had left things at his death. This again was an intereſting ſubject in the reign of Caligula or of his ſucceſſor Claudius; but who would concern themſelves about this 40 years afterwards, when new and ſtill more ſtrange revolutions of the Roman empire had become frequent? With how little propriety likewiſe could Philo himſelf apply to Caligula *in particular* this reflexion, *How long ſhall we grey old men be boys in our expectation of permanency in human proſperity*, after he had lived 40 years longer to ſee the ſtill more extraordinary reverſes of fortune, which took place before he was grey? His reflexion concern-

ing the different effects of *virtues* and *vices* upon the proſperity of an empire, was intimately connected with and aroſe naturally from his view of the novel and unexpected reverſe under Caligula inſtead of the proſperity under Tiberius; but there could be no propriety in the reflexion, nor any events to lead his mind to it 40 years afterwards, when there was no longer any thing novel or unexpected in the total revolutions which happened, and without any reſpect to either *virtues* or *vices*. Again, he ſays expreſsly, that he wrote the account of his embaſſy to Caligula *in order to record both what we ſaw and what we heard on this occaſion.* Would a perſon with ſuch a view before him delay his account for a great number of years until he was old and grey? Thoſe words rather afford an indication, that he committed the facts to paper immediately, leſt he ſhould forget them, and either before the death of Caligula, which happened within leſs than four months after, or early in the reign of his ſucceſſor Claudius; and the minuteneſs of his account of all the petty circumſtances which occurred in his interview with Caligula and of other petty hiſtoric facts of that time, confirm, that it was writ ſoon after thoſe events, while they were freſh in his memory.

mory. Neither are any of thoſe facts there related, ſuch as happened later than the death of Caligula, or at lateſt the acceſſion of Claudius in 41: but that a ſcribbling old man ſhould at a great diſtance of time afterwards never tranſgreſs chronologic accuracy, either through want of memory, or from an itch of moralizing, ſeems highly improbable; and the fact is more naturally accounted for, by the preſumption, that he had writ, if not circulated this account of his embaſſy among the Jews before any later events had happened. Moreover, he ſometimes addreſſes himſelf to Caligula as if he was then actually living, as for inſtance, "Dic mihi, Caie, an ne Deus fieri poſtulas?" Is it poſſible, that a writer of a brief memoir and hiſtoric memorandums concerning a ſingle event could be thus abſurd? It is ſcarcely excuſable even for a rhetorical and philoſophic hiſtorian to make uſe of ſuch extravagant apoſtrophes to a man who had been long dead; more eſpecially when, inſtead of ſuch apoſtrophes, it would have been more conſonant to Philo's profeſſed object of inſtruction in his view, if he had carried down his relation to the tragical death of Caligula in his being murdered with contempt and deteſtation by his own guards; and

and this within three months after his abuſe of Philo for not worſhipping him as a God. Thus this moral tale to ſhew the ill effects of *vices* would have ended with a fatal cataſtrophe much more weighty and inſtructive than all Philo's moral reflections and rhetorical apoſtrophes to a dead man. His omiſſion then to continue his narration down to Caligula's tragical end, can be reaſonably accounted for only upon the *preſumption* which ariſes from all the reſt of the context, that the tract was writ before the death of Caligula: neither could any account of this event have been conſiſtently added afterwards, unleſs Philo had expunged all his apoſtrophes to Caligula as a man ſtill alive. There is however one objection which has been ſtarted to this early date of this tract, which requires to be conſidered, namely, that mention is made in it of *Claudius Cæſar*, by which appellation it is alledged, that Claudius muſt have become *Emperor* before the compoſition of the tract in queſtion. Now although it ſhould be granted, that ſuch a concluſion will follow from the appellation of *Cæſar* being given to Claudius; yet it ſeems to prove nothing againſt the more early date of the tract in preference to that of 10, 30 or 40 years afterwards; becauſe there was only

only an interval of three or four months between Philo's interview with Caligula and the acceſſion of Claudius: it can therefore be only concluded thence, that although the tract was chiefly writ before the death of Caligula; yet it was not quite finiſhed and circulated until after the acceſſion of Claudius. But beſides this concluſion, it is not a real fact, that the appellation of *Cæſar*, while any of the Julian family were on the throne, was any certain proof, that the perſon to whom it was applied, was then become *Emperor*, as I ſhall prove againſt thoſe who ſeem to think it a ſtrong evidence. So that hitherto we have found *Allix*'s argument valid; for ſince this tract muſt have been *writ* very ſoon after the embaſſy of Philo in queſtion, the dates of that *event* and of the *compoſition* of the tract ſo nearly coincided, that conſequently in *any ſenſe* of his words he confeſſes himſelf to be a *grey-headed old man about* the year 40 after Chriſt; and thus his uſe of Λογος could not have been borrowed from the Chriſtians, ſtill leſs from St. John, who was the lateſt of the Evangeliſts.

The caſe is exactly the ſame with reſpect to that other tract of Philo ſtill extant upon the ſame ſubject, and compoſed about the

the ſame time and with the ſame view, containing an account of the oppreſſions of the Jews by Flaccus, while governor of Alexandria before the year 38*. In this however he continues his account down to the tragical death of Flaccus; which again renders it probable, that he would have done the ſame in the foregoing tract, if it had not been compoſed before Caligula's death. But in the preſent one alſo no facts are mentioned later than the death of Flaccus by order of Caligula, which happened about the year 38; ſo that this tract likewiſe was probably writ immediately after that event; and to this tract Philo's account of his embaſſy to Caligula would become a proper and connected *ſequel*. There is however one paſſage in the tract againſt Flaccus, which has been urged as a proof, that it was not compoſed till *long after* his death, namely, becauſe Philo calls *certain flagitious or oppreſſive acts* (done dur-

* Fabricius in his Biblioth. Græc. tom. 3, mentions four or five tracts writ by Philo on ſimilar ſubjects, and all entitled *De Virtutibus*, of which he thinks this tract againſt Flaccus one; but no ſuch title has been preſerved to this tract in the MSS. and I can find no foundation for this ſuppoſition of Fabricius, nor that any other of Philo's tracts was ſo intitled, except the foregoing one concerning Caligula.

ing

ing the adminiſtration of Flaccus at Alexandria) by the appellation of *antient ones*; but the reaſon of his ſo calling them may through haſte be overlooked; he did not mean *antient* with reſpect to the later time of his *writing* that account, but with reſpect to that *final and ſingle year* of the adminiſtration of Flaccus at Alexandria, which alone is contained in his account: for it is only the *laſt and ſixth* year of Flaccus there that Philo deſcribes, being the only one which fell in the reign of Caligula; the preceding five years fell in the reign of Tiberius, and were therefore foreign from his ſubject, as being more *antient* than the period in queſtion.* How much *more antient* the *acts* in queſtion were does not appear, but it was at leaſt *two* years before the *laſt* of Flaccus†: neither were theſe *antient injuries* or rather *flagitious acts* in queſtion, ſuch as had been done by Flaccus

* Philo relates, that Flaccus was appointed by Tiberius governor of Alexandria for the term of ſix years, the firſt five of which coincided with the laſt five of Tiberius, and the ſixth with the firſt of Caligula; at the end of which or ſoon after he was removed, judged and condemned.

† As appears from the following paſſage concerning *Lampo* one of the perſons concerned in thoſe *flagitious acts*. "Lampone accuſato imperatis erga Tiberium cæſarem et hâc cauſâ fatigato per *biennium* a Flacco."

againſt the Jews; but what had been done by two vicious men Lampo and Iſidorus againſt the inhabitants of Alexandria and againſt Flaccus himſelf, and in part only by Flaccus againſt them.* "Theſe more *antient unjuſt acts* of all parties, ſays Philo, which I have now related, I have not mentioned in order to call to remembrance the mere acts themſelves, for they did not relate to the Jews, and they *preceded* the year of the adminiſtration of Flaccus which concerns his ill conduct to the Jews: but I have related them, becauſe thoſe two very men Lampo and Iſidorus were now appointed by Caligula to judge Flaccus, who as governor at Alexandria, had formerly judged them and inflicted puniſhment on them; in order that we may hence learn to hold in admiration the juſtice of Divine Providence; by which it came to paſs that the accuſation and judgement of Flaccus as governor of Alexandria ſhould happen to fall to the lot of thoſe two very men, who had been the moſt obnoxious to Flaccus while governor there, and were his greateſt enemies."

* "Non tantum honoratiores ſed et *univerſi cives* ad concionem venerunt—et coram arguebant Iſidorum auctorem tumultus et conviciorum, quæ *in Flaccum* jactata fuerunt."

Thus *

* Thus when this paſſage is rightly explained, it appears to contain no evidence, but that the tract againſt Flaccus was compoſed *ſoon after* the events related in it, and the *more antient ones* there mentioned were only ſo relatively to the *ſubject* of that tract, the oppreſſion of the Jews in the *laſt* year of Flaccus at Alexandria.

Having thus removed the only apparent objection concerning the *time*, when Philo wrote the above tract, it may be ſtill expedient that I ſhould attend to a ſimilar objection, which has been made to the other tract againſt Caligula being writ before his death. This objection ariſes from the mention made there of *Claudius Germanicus Cæſar*. †

For it may be there alledged, that as Claudius is called *Cæſar*, he muſt have been Emperor *before* Philo wrote this tract. But this is a reaſon, which is by no means ſolid; his being called *Cæſar* is no certain proof, that Caligula was dead and Claudius on the throne *before* the tract was written.

* " Hæc prolixius memoravi, *non ut refricarem veteres injurias*, ſed quòd mirarer inſpectatricem rerum humanarum juſtitiam, quâ factum eſt, ut omnium inſenſiſſimis obtingeret accuſatio præſidis [Flacci]."
—Ουκ ὑπερ του παλαιων απομνημονεύειν αδικη ματων—

† Κλαυδιου Γερμανικου Καισαρος.

If indeed he had been ſtyled *Auguſtus*, it would have been a certain proof of the acceſſion of Claudius; but *Cæſar* was *then* a family name and aſſumed by all, who were adopted into the family of Julius Cæſar. Accordingly *Caius* and *Lucius* the ſons of Agrippa by Julia are ſtyled *Cæſars* both in books and inſcriptions, yet neither of them lived to be *emperors*; they were intitled to the name on account of their having been adopted as ſons by Tiberius Cæſar. Thus Suetonius relates, that Tiberius wrote a poem called *Conqueſtio de Lucii Cæſaris morte* (in Tiberio ſect. 70). Claudius in like manner had a right to the title of Cæſar *before* he was emperor, in caſe he had been adopted as ſon by Tiberius or Caligula: here then is the only difficulty, whether he ever had been adopted or not. By Auguſtus he apparently had not been adopted; for Suetonius relates, that when Germanicus (ſon of Druſus Germanicus) and elder brother of Claudius was adopted *ſon and Cæſar* by Auguſtus, Claudius took up the *cognomen* of Germanicus* to which name he was

* "Fratre majore [Germanico] in Juliam familiam adoptato, Germanici cognomen aſſumſit Claudius." *Sueton. in Claudio. Sect. 2.*

indeed

indeed intitled as being the cognomen aſſumed by his Father Druſus, and which Claudius had a right to claim as hereditary, if he pleaſed. Now hence it appears plauſible enough, that when Germanicus was adopted ſon and *Cæſar* by Auguſtus, Claudius was not adopted into the Julian family, therefore not entitled to the name of Cæſar. Yet he might ſtill have been adopted by Caligula, who as ſoon as he became emperor, ſent for Claudius, and made him conſul; heaping alſo other favors on him, and ſometimes permitting him to preſide at public games in place of the emperor Caligula. Suetonius indeed does not add, that Caligula adopted him, but it is no way improbable, and we have other inſtances, wherein all direct information of this kind has been accidentally omitted by the hiſtorians now extant. Thus no hiſtorian has formally related, that Marcellus was adopted by Auguſtus, yet the fact appears to have been ſo by an accidental phraſe of Plutarch, who ſays, " that when Marcellus was married to Julia, Auguſtus made him both his ſon and ſon-in-law at the ſame time."* Now that Claudius had been adopted by one of the three preceding

* Ἅμα παιδα και γαμβρον εποιησατο.

emperors

emperors is the more probable, becauſe Claudius aſſumed the title of *Cæſar* along with that of *Auguſtus* in his very firſt year of reign: yet if he had not been adopted, he had no claim to the appellation of *Cæſar* then any more than before; and he muſt in ſuch caſe have aſſumed it merely by his own power and authority; which if the real fact, it was at leaſt the *firſt example* of any perſon *adopting himſelf* into the Julian family; and yet it is not noticed by hiſtorians or antiquarians as an innovation introduced by Claudius. However it muſt be allowed, that Philo generally adds *Cæſar* to the name of the ſeveral emperors, whom he has occaſion to mention, and ſometimes employs it even by itſelf to denote the reigning emperor. But in the preſent caſe, whether it meant emperor or not here, becomes the more doubtful, becauſe there is poſitive evidence extant of Claudius having been adopted; although indeed there is ſome incoherence in it, for Dio ſeems to aſcribe it to Auguſtus in contradiction to the above account from Suetonius, while an inſcription on a medal makes him adopted by Tiberius *. The name of Claudi-

* "Germanicus Cæſar et Tib. Claudius Nero filii Druſi, in honorem patris munus gladiatorium præbuerunt;

anus can refer only to the younger brother, Tiberius Claudius, but the words *administratione belli* can refer only to the eldeſt Germanicus; this makes it doubtful as to which of the two Dio meant to ſay was adopted into the family of Auguſtus. Perhaps there may not be the ſame ambiguity in the Greek text, which I have not at hand to conſult. On the other hand Onuphrius Panvinius produces a legend in which Claudius is ſtyled *Tiberii filius.*

C. Cæſar. Divi. Aug. pron. Aug. P. M. Tr. P. 3. P. P.
A tergo vero.
Germanicus Cæſar. Ti. Aug. F. Divi. Aug. N.
*Panvinii Faſti in Comment.* 198.

*Caius Aug.* can be no other than Caligula, and Panvinius places his *third Tribun. Poteſt.* in his ſecond or third year of reign. There was then no other *Germanicus* alive except Claudius, who is here ſtiled *Cæſar*, before he was become emperor, and alſo *Tiberii Auguſti filius Divi Auguſti Nepos.* But in all inſcriptions after he was emperor, he is ſtiled only *Druſi filius:* yet this might

buerunt; hoc plebem memoriâ Druſi recreavit, idque etiam, quod in dedicatione ædis Caſtoris et Pollucis non Claudiani modo (adoptatus enim in familiam Auguſti Claudianum ſe nuncupabat) ſed Druſi etiam nomen ei impoſuit; frequenter ſolitus ab *adminiſtratione belli* in urbem commeare." *Dio apud Cæſar. Auguſt.*

be

be done to ingratiate himſelf with the military, of whom he was much afraid, and who reſpected greatly the name of Druſus; it was indeed his being *Druſi filius*, which made him emperor, as may be ſeen in Suetonius. Theſe incoherences operate as much againſt one ſide of the queſtion as the other, therefore upon the whole they ſufficiently prove at leaſt, that no *certainty* of Claudius having been then emperor can be deduced from Philo's appellation of *Cæſar:* and even if it proved the utmoſt, it can prove nothing more, than that the tract was not finiſhed until *after* the death of Caligula, which was within four months after Philo's interview.*

Thus then I have *confirmed* the ſolidity of Allix's proof from the old age of Philo in the year 40, that he could not

* Philo tells Caligula, that the Jews had offered hecatombs a third time on account of his *Germanic victory* [immolavimus hecatombas τριτον κατα την ελπιδα της Γερμανικης νικης] His Germanic expedition was in the year 40 and when he returned to Rome he acted the farce of an *ovation:* as Caligula was at Puteoli when he gave audience to Philo; this muſt therefore be after his return from Germany, and Suetonius mentions, that Caligula was ſlain within four months after his *ovation.* "Ovans urbem ingreſſus eſt, intraque quartum menſem periit." Now he was ſlain near the end of January 41; Philo's audience therefore muſt have been later than the beginning of the preceding October in the year 40.

*poſſibly* have borrowed the uſe of *Logos* from the belief of the Chriſtians, any more than he could have *probably* borrowed it ſolely from Plato; and that it was *in reality* from the religious opinions of his own nation that the *ſubſtance* of it was taken, although he did indeed trim it up in ſeveral *circumſtances* more than it had been before, after the model of Plato's Logos; and all this even agreeably to the expreſs words and opinion of Baſnage himſelf.

But there ſtill remains *another proof* to the ſame purport, which has not been noticed by Allix, and which at leaſt ſtrongly confirms, that Philo's tract on his embaſſy could not have been writ *later* than the reign of Claudius. Euſebius in his eccleſiaſtic hiſtory gives an account of Philo and his writings, wherein he expreſſly mentions ſome tract or tracts of that author againſt Caligula, entitled Περι Αρετων, as having been read before the Roman Senate in the reign of Claudius; let us then enquire whether there be any reaſon to ſuppoſe the tract ſo read to be any other than this very one ſtill extant: The words of Euſebius, which I have ſubjoined, ſeem to me to have been miſinterpreted by all thoſe writers, who have referred to them for evidence, whereby they have propagated an opinion concerning

ſome *ironical* tract having been compoſed by Philo againſt Caligula, and *different* from that now extant under the title of Περι Αρετων. But whether this accuſation be juſt or not, yet my proof ariſing from theſe words of Euſebius in favor of the tract now extant having been writ as early as the reign of Claudius, will not be altered thereby, and does not depend on that circumſtance; ſo that it is only for the ſake of removing an eſtabliſhed error that I firſt conſider the true meaning of Euſebius, and not that my own *proof* reſts only upon this new ſenſe and foundation*. Now all writers, who have quoted this paſſage, ſuppoſe Euſebius to mean, that Philo had written an *ironical tract* concerning the *virtues* of Caligula, in order to expoſe his vices; and that it was a different one from that *ſerious ſatire* againſt him, which is ſtill extant and is entitled Περι Αρετων, *de virtutibus*. Thus Allix plainly underſtood Euſebius to mean an ironical tract intitled *The Virtues of Caius Caligula, the ſcope of which was to ſhew his*

* Ουτος μεν ουν [ Φιλωνος ] κατα Γαιον επι Ρωμης αφικομενος, τα της θεοσιυγιας Γαιου γραφεντα αυτω, ὰ μετα ηθους και ειρωνειας επεγραψεν περι Αρετων, επι πασης λεγεται της Ρωμαιων Συγκλητου κατα Κλαυδιον διελθειν ὡς και της εν βιβλιοθηκαις αναθεσεως θαυμασθεντας αυτου καταξιωθηναι τους λογους. *Lib.* 2. 18.

*impiety*

*impiety* †. Mr. Whitaker underſtands Euſebius in the ſame manner, as meaning an *ironical* tract different from that now extant*. But I find nothing, which is mentioned by Euſebius as being *ironical* except the *title* only, and not the *contents* of the tract. He ſays nothing more than "that what had been writ by Philo concerning the impiety of Caius [in making himſelf a God] and which he had ingeniouſly and ironically intituled *concerning virtues*, was recited before the whole ſenate in the reign of Claudius." The tract now extant is accordingly intituled *concerning Virtues* [Περι Αρετων] and it treats of that very ſubject mentioned by Euſebius as its contents, viz. the impiety of Caius in making himſelf a God; why then is not the tract now extant that very one referred to by Euſebius or at leaſt one part of it? Euſebius only ſeems to have underſtood the *title* to have been ironical, and not the

† "Euſebius ſaith, that Philo recited in full ſenate in the reign of Claudius, his book intitled *The Virtues of Caius Caligula*, though it was the ſcope of that book to ſhew the impiety of that monſter, that would be worſhipped as a God." p. 81.

* "The account of Philo's *embaſſy to Caligula*, now extant, was not written at the ſame time with *that diſſertation* on the impiety of Caligula, which he denominated *an eulogium on his virtues*, and recited before all the ſenate of Rome in the reign of Claudiu." *Origin of Arianiſm. p.* 165.

*contents*: but perhaps he was miſtaken concerning the title, in conceiving Philo to have impoſed it in an ironical ſenſe, as if it meant *the virtues of Caius*; when it was meant in a ſerious ſenſe, as Philo explains himſelf in the body of the tract, to diſplay *in general* the good effects of *virtues* by ſhewing the ill effects of *vices*, and it had no ironical reference to the *virtues in particular* of Caligula. But whether Euſebius was miſtaken or not in conceiving the *title* to have been impoſed *ironically*; yet no concluſion can be drawn hence, that the tract now extant is not that very tract referred to in this paſſage of Euſebius. For any difference of opinion concerning the *meaning* of Περι Αρετων (whether it is to be underſtood ironically as referring to the *virtues* of Caius *in particular*, or ſeriouſly as pointing out *in general* the benefit of virtues by diſplaying the ill effects of vices in the conduct of Caligula) yet this can neither alter the *words* of the title nor the *contents* of the *ſubject* of the tract now extant; both of which are conformable to the account given by Euſebius of the tract read to the ſenate in the reign of Claudius; there being no mention made by him of any thing ironical contained in the tract itſelf. But if any perſon ſhould think differently concerning this matter; yet,

yet, as I ſaid before, it will make no alteration in the *proof*, which may be drawn from this account of Euſebius, that the tract now extant muſt have been writ in the reign of Claudius, as deduceable from the concluſion of it. For Philo finiſhes his relation of his embaſſy to Caligula with the ſubjoined words.* Now if the tract at preſent extant be not that referred to by Euſebius, it muſt probably be this other tract, which Philo here mentions at the concluſion, and which he ſtyles a *Palinodia to Caius*; for *Palinodia* means a *recantation* and as the tract extant is a *ſerious ſatire*, Palinodia would be a proper word to expreſs the directly contrary, that is, an *ironical eulogium*, which Philo might have poſſibly intituled Περι Αρετων as well as the other ſerious ſatire, although he has not here mentioned this. But hence it follows, that if this Palinodia was the ironical tract mentioned by Euſebius as having been recited in the reign of Claudius, it was a *ſequel* to the tract now extant; conſequently the tract now extant muſt have

* Ειρηται μεν ουν κεφαλαιωδεστερον ἡ αιτια της προς ἁπαν το Ιουδαιων εθνος απεχθειας Γαιου· λεκτεον δε και την Παλινωδιαν προς Γαιον. *Diximus in ſumma cauſam odii, quo Caius Judæorum nationem proſequebatur; ſupereſt autem ut etiam dicamus illam Palinodiam de Caio.*

been

been compoſed in the reign of Claudius likewiſe, as being prior to the ironical one. If on the other hand the tract now extant was that identical one mentioned by Euſebius, as recited in the reign of Claudius, we can then only form conjectures concerning the ſubject of the later tract called *Palinodia*; and it is not impoſſible, but it might contain a ſerious *relation* concerning Claudius having repealed the edicts of Caius ſo obnoxious to the Jews: ſo that the flattery contained in it might contribute more to its ſucceſs and recommendation than its merit in other reſpects. That Philo ſhould omit altogether ſuch a favorable opportunity of ingratiating the Jews with the new Emperor is not very probable, when we read in the tract now extant, that the Jews had gone as great a length as the heathens in their flattery even of Caligula upon every event which concerned him, ſuch as his illneſs, the death of Druſilla, and the farce of his victory in Germany. It was at leaſt agreeable to the practice of Euſebius to give the appellation of *Palinodia* to the repeal of a diſagreeable edict. Thus when Maximin repealed his ſevere edict againſt the Chriſtians, Euſebius ſays "Proponuntur per civitates imperialia edicta, Palinodiam eorum, quæ adverſum

adverſum nos acta fuerant.—Hæc itaque Palinodia propoſita—hujuſmodi Palinodiâ haud quaquam delectatus Maximinus, &c." *Lib.* 8. *ult.* & 9. 1. But whatever was the ſubject of this ſecond tract called by Philo a Palinodia, whether it was an *ironical eulogium* on Caligula and the one mentioned by Euſebius, or whether it was a *ſerious relation* of the repeal by Claudius of the edicts of Caligula, yet in *either caſe* it was a *ſequel* to the tract now extant; which therefore muſt have been writ in the reign of Claudius, it being totally improbable, but that one or other of theſe *two* tracts was the very one referred to by Euſebius as recited under that Emperor.

If Philo then was a *grey headed* old man in the year 40, about which time he wrote the account of his embaſſy, and if he was really the author of the *Book of Wiſdom*, this book muſt have been writ in his youth or *before* Chriſtianity appeared, agreeably to his own account of his theologic ſtudies: But it is more probable, that ſome Greek Fathers erroneouſly attributed that book to him, for no other reaſon, than becauſe it contained mention of the *Logos*, like Philo's other works; they knowing of no other Jewiſh author except Philo, who had ever mentioned a doctrine ſo ſi-

milar to Chriſtian opinions, as they were ignorant of the doctrines of the Jewiſh doctors concealed in their provincial Chaldee dialect. Thus this tradition aroſe from the difficulty they found to account for the doctrine of a divine Logos being diſplayed in that Jewiſh book. And from a ſimilar difficulty aroſe probably that other tradition of Philo's being converted to Chriſtianity, the Greek Fathers being no other way able to account for Philo's doctrine of the divine Logos, which pervades almoſt all his writings and which had ſo much ſimilarity to Chriſtianity. Both traditions apparently were nothing more than conjectures of the Greek Fathers, to which they had recourſe, on account of their ignorance of the provincial tongue of the Jews, to give ſome reaſon for finding a Chriſtian doctrine in a Jewiſh author. Their ignorance of the true cauſe, that the divine Logos was a Jewiſh idea and phraſe before it was a Chriſtian one, made them take up with imaginary cauſes, which had not the leaſt foundation in truth. Certainly moreover there are ſeveral neutral paſſages in the Book of Wiſdom, which are very ſimilar to others in the New Teſtament; yet they are not ſuch as can prove, whether the authors of the latter made

alluſions

alluſions to the former or contrariwiſe; they might have been copied by all parties, not from each other, but from that common ſyſtem of Jewiſh theology, to which the Jewiſh Chriſtians were no more ſtrangers than the Jew Philo, or the Jewiſh author of the Book of Wiſdom, whoever he was:* and as there are no other paſſages in the Book of Wiſdom, which contain the leaſt traces of Chriſtianity, except it be that mention of the Divine Logos, it is totally improbable, that the author ſhould have been ſo far a Chriſtian, as to borrow this and no

* For example "Judicabunt Juſti Nationes" *Sapient.* 3. 8. Huetius and others have thought, that St. Paul alluded to this paſſage, when he ſaid "Anne neſcitis, quoniam ſancti de hoc mundo judicabunt? 1 *Cor.* 6. 2.—So M. Simon makes no difficulty to affirm, "that when St. Paul ſays of Chriſt ὃς ὢν ἀπαυγασμα [Hebr. 1. 3.] he alludes to theſe words in the Book of Wiſdom ἀπαυγασμα γαρ εστι." 7. 26. *Crit. de Dupin. tom.* 3. 25. But the very ſame words are found in Philo, and none of theſe authors might imitate each other, but all borrow in common from expreſſions well known in Jewiſh theology. From ſuch ſimilar phraſes as theſe the Greek fathers apparently concluded the Book of Wiſdom to have been writ by Philo, while Simon concludes that St. Paul imitated the Book of Wiſdom, and others, that he imitated Philo: and yet all three might have imitated the Chaldee paraphraſes, where *gloriam Domini, majeſtatem Domini* are often found in the ſenſe of *Logos Domini.*

other Chriſtian articles. It has been ſaid indeed, that the reaſon of this is, becauſe he purpoſely concealed his Chriſtianity under a ſhew of Judaiſm; but if this was the fact, why diſcover himſelf by the mention of the name *Logos*, in caſe this was ſolely a Chriſtian doctrine, and not a Jewiſh one likewiſe? It muſt in truth be allowed, that the author has concealed his Chriſtianity, and indeed ſo effectually concealed it, that not the leaſt marks of it are any where to be found: for even thoſe neutral paſſages above-mentioned, although ſomething ſimilar to them may be found in the New Teſtament; yet while they are neutral with reſpect to their containing any traces of Chriſtianity, they are not ſo with reſpect to Judaiſm, but often exhibit fixed principles of Jewiſh theology, ſuch as that the Jews were a nation of ſaints, who ſhould judge the heathens. Neither could Philo at Rome, if an old man in the year 40 and not converted until 55, know any thing of St. Paul's 1ſt Cor. not writ until about 57; nor contrariwiſe St. Paul know any thing of Philo's Book of *Wiſdom*, if it was writ by him later than his being made a Chriſtian about 55: much leſs could Philo learn any thing about the Chriſtian *Logos* before the publication

lication of St. John's Goſpel, which although uncertain in regard to the date, yet being the lateſt of the Evangeliſts, Philo could not then be much leſs than 100 years old.

But if I may be permitted to indulge in the modern mode of placing great dependance upon ſlight conjectures, we may not unreaſonably conclude from that very name *Logos* for a divine Agent in the Book of Wiſdom, that it muſt have been compoſed before Chriſtianity was preached; ſince it has not the dignified Chriſtian idea annexed to it, which it moſt probably would have had, if writ by a Chriſtian; but it is well ſuited to the ideas of the Jews, who gave the name of Logoi to angels, as we know both from Philo's information and own practice: and as the book was writ by a Jew, ſo it was probably before the propagation of Chriſtianity, otherwiſe the author would as ſtudiouſly have avoided that appellation altogether, as other Jews did, when they found this name for the Meſſiah to be adopted by the Chriſtians. Theſe conjectures ſeem more plauſible, than that the book in queſtion ſhould have been writ by a Jew converted to Chriſtianity, who wiſhed to conceal his Chriſtian principles, and in effect did ſo in all caſes ex-

cept one; which however muſt have diſcovered him more than any other, in caſe the idea of a divine Agent under the appellation of *Logos* was *ſolely* a Chriſtian tenet, and not *equally* a Jewiſh one at the time when that work was compoſed.

There is one circumſtance moreover, which again affords ſome ground for conjecture, that the Book of Wiſdom was familiar to the firſt Jewiſh Chriſtians. For it is well known, that Juſtin accuſed the Jews of amputating the words *a ligno*, απο ξυλου, from the 95th Pſalm in the ſentence "Dicite in gentibus Dominus regnavit *a ligno*" Dial. Try. The accuſation is now univerſally allowed to be not true; yet it cannot be reaſonably ſuppoſed, that Juſtin made a falſe accuſation intentionally; there muſt have been ſome ground-work for it, although then forgot, as he probably only ſpoke the general opinion of the Chriſtians in his own age. Now Heinſius has ſhewn, that it was common both with Jews and Chriſtians to join together parts of different portions of ſcripture into one ſentence.* As the Jews then were ever

* Exercit. ſacr. c. 8. and 21.

"Tua providentia, Pater, potens eſt *ex omnibus ſanare* benedictum eſt enim *lignum*, per quod fit *Juſtitia*; per manus autem quod fit idolum maledictum eſt

et

ready to reproach the Chriſtians with this ſentence " Maledictum eſſe omnem, qui pendet *in ligno*;" it was natural for the Chriſtians to have ſome ſcriptural ſentence for a reply, ſuch as the Book of Wiſdom would afford them " Benedictum eſſe *lignum* per quod fit Juſtitia." *c.* 14. 6 *&c:* and the whole paſſage there concerning the ſalvation of Noah's family by the ark *of wood* is ſo parallel to the 10th v. of 95th Pſalm, which was thought prophetic of the ſalvation by Chriſt, that the firſt Chriſtians might have borrowed from the Book of Wiſdom the idea of *ſanare per lignum* in order to form a more complete reply to the above reproach of the Jews; but in the age of Juſtin the origin of this *addition* might be forgot, and thereby the Jews accuſed of *amputation*. If this was the caſe, the Book of Wiſdom muſt have been more antient than the old age of Philo, for it to be ſo well known in Judæa to the firſt Jewiſh Chriſtians. But even if this was not the origin of the *addition* of *a ligno*, yet if there was any actual imitation be-

et ipſum & qui fecit illud." *Sapient.* 14. " Dicite in gentibus quia Dominus regnavit [*a ligno*]—Judicabit populos *in Juſtitia*—tunc exultabunt omnia *ligna* ſylvæ, quia venit judicare terram." *Pſ.* 95. *v.* 10.

tween

tween any paſſages in St. Paul and the Book of Wiſdom, it is totally improbable, that the author of the latter ſhould be the imitator; for in ſuch caſe he would certainly have found ſomething more ſtriking and peculiar in St. Paul's Chriſtianity to have imitated, than ſuch paſſages as are either altogether neutral or only connected with Jewiſh theology.

Thus then I have adduced farther evidence in confirmation of thoſe *four antient* witneſſes, cotemporary with Chriſt or not long after, to which I had appealed in my foregoing *Remarks*, viz. Philo, the Book of Wiſdom, the Chaldee paraphraſes and thoſe philoſophic commentaries of Jews on their ſcriptures, now called Cabaliſtic, ſhewing that all of them do contain teſtimonies to a knowledge by the Jews of the *appellation* and *character* of a divine Logos as a current name for the Meſſiah, and in ſome ſenſe of *divinity* or other, even before the appearance of Chriſtianity as well as afterwards. In regard to which teſtimonies moreover, I have proved, that Baſnage, inſtead of being a *counter evidence* againſt me, does on the contrary agree with me in all the moſt material articles; eſpecially in *concluding*, that it was from this domeſtic information contained in Jewiſh theology,

theology, that St. John and others of the firſt Jewiſh Chriſtians drew all their own knowledge both of the *idea* and *name* of divine Logos (ſo far as related to mere human knowledge) which they accordingly tranſmitted to the firſt Greek fathers along with the reſt of Chriſtianity; ſo that this doctrine was no innovation introduced by the latter *directly* from Platoniſm a century after the death of Chriſt, but was coeval with its infancy; yet without any ſuſpicion by its firſt Chriſtian authors, that it had been in any degree tinged with Platoniſm in a *circuitous* manner by the Jews themſelves long before the riſe of Chriſtianity.

Beſides this pretended *counter evidence* from the *opinions* of Baſnage againſt the belief of a *divine Logos* by the Jews, Dr. P. has alledged moreover the *acknowledgments* of the Greek fathers of the firſt centuries after Chriſt, and alſo the conceptions of *modern Jews* concerning the belief of their anceſtors in the age of Chriſt; with reſpect to which two latter ſubjects, although he has advanced many aſſertions different from the truth, and produced alſo many quotations which do not apply to the queſtion, yet I muſt at preſent content myſelf with what I have already occaſionally intermixed

termixed in the above diſcuſſion of the erroneous *opinions* aſcribed to Baſnage. And indeed in regard to all theſe ſubjects, a great variety of additional evidence may be ſtill collected both from learned modern Jews and Chriſtians to refute the *hiſtoric error* of the Unitarians, in attributing to the age of Juſtin, and other Greek fathers, the firſt introduction of the divinity of the Chriſtian Logos, and of this appellation for the Chriſt, which on the contrary were in fact coeval with the Chriſtian revelation and introduced by the Jewiſh Chriſtians themſelves, not by Platonizing Greeks.* Neither can any *erroneous* Platonic tinge, which this doctrine may have received in the hands of the Jews, be any objection to the ſame Chriſtian doctrine when diſplayed according *to the truth*, any more than the *erroneous* ideas, which the Jews had concerning a

* I may here obſerve for example, that the name *Logos* for Chriſt muſt have been familiar to the firſt Jewiſh Chriſtians, whether Ebionites or not, as appears by an extract of Clemens from the ſpurious work called, *The preaching of Peter*, writ on the principles of the Jewiſh Chriſtians and apparently *before* the age of Juſtin; but certainly not copied from his pretendedly Platonizing Chriſtianity—" Lex et *verbum* ipſe Salvator dicitur, prout aſſerit Petrus *in prædicatione*." Νομος και Λογος αυτος ὁ σωτηρ λεγεται, ὡς Πετρος εν κηρυγματι. *Clementis eclogæ ſect.* 58. That this tract was older than Juſtin, appears from its being quoted by Heracleon as early as in 130.

tem-

temporal Meſſiah, can form any objection to the Chriſtian *true* conceptions of a ſpiritual Chriſt, or than many other Jewiſh errors, which were at firſt tranſmitted into Chriſtianity by the Jewiſh Chriſtians, and afterwards corrected, while others remained uncorrected for a longer time. Among theſe we may include the chief part of the Roman corruptions; for now that the animoſities between Romaniſts and Proteſtants are much abated, it muſt be allowed, that the principal part of thoſe corruptions were in like manner derived from the ſource of Jewiſh theology, and not as the Proteſtants have alledged, from Heatheniſm, ſuch as prayers for the dead, the invocation of ſaints and angels, and many others up to the tranſubſtantiation of a fallible Jewiſh high prieſt into the impeccable divine Logos. Theſe all ſubſiſted in Chriſtianity during the third century, and before it had gained any civil eſtabliſhment; but before this there could ſcarcely be any poſſibility, that Chriſtians could imitate Heathen cuſtoms: and thus theſe immaculate Jews of the Unitarians have in fact been every way the chief corruptors of Chriſtianity. Neither again, can ſuch parts of the Jewiſh conceptions of a di-

vine Logos as were agreeable to *Chriſtian truth* form any objection againſt the latter, on the ground of its not being a total novelty in religious belief; for then by the ſame way of reaſoning equal objection may be made to the Chriſtian conceptions of the attributes of the Deity, of morality and a future ſtate; all which opinions had obtained ſome foundation in the belief of mankind before the Chriſtian revelation was made known: which latter did not propoſe to introduce a totally new ſyſtem of religion, but only to communicate more juſt and clear notions of it, and to annex more forcible ſanctions for human practice agreeably to this better knowledge of divine truths.

After having thus aſcertained the *true ſtate* of antient *facts*, and alſo ſhewn, that ſuch a true ſtate of them is no way injurious to Chriſtianity, it may be ſtill expedient to enquire more minutely in what circumſtance that falſe tinge chiefly conſiſted, which had been given to the doctrine of the Logos in Jewiſh theology: and this we ſhall find to have been rather of a Jewiſh and *popular* nature, than of a Platonic and *philoſophic* one; ſo far as we are enabled to judge from the works of Philo,

Philo, who has given us more information than we can obtain elſewhere concerning the opinions of the antient Jews on this ſubject. Now it has obviouſly occurred to all readers of Philo, that there is a great incoherency in his accounts of the divine Logos; for it is ſometimes exalted by him to an equality in *wiſdom* and *reaſon* with the Supreme Father, and at other times lowered down to the ſubordinate character of a mere *ſpirit*, *angel*, *meſſenger* and *repreſentative* of the Deity: but I know of no author, neither Sandius, Nye, Le Clerc or any other, who has traced out the origin of this apparent diſcordancy, which having been tranſmitted into Chriſtianity has been productive of much miſchief by ſeparating Chriſtians into the different ſects of Arians, &c; an evil which has again ariſen from the ſource of Jewiſh theology. It is very well known, that the Greek word *Logos* has two ſenſes, in one of which it means the intellectual faculty of *wiſdom* or *reaſon*, and in the other that audible *language* or *words* whereby the conceptions of the intellectual faculty are communicated to others. Anaxagoras, Timæus, Plato and all other Greek philoſophers employed *Logos* always in the former of theſe

two ſenſes as denoting *internal reaſon*, which may be therefore called its *philoſophic* ſenſe; but the latter was the more general meaning of *Logos* in the Greek language, as ſignifying *external diſcourſe* or *words* delivered, and this was conſequently a more *popular* ſenſe of the word. The *philoſophic* ſenſe therefore of Logos coincided of itſelf with the *wiſdom* of God, deſcribed in Proverbs and other parts of the Old Teſtament, as the chief agent at the creation, and which the Septuagint always expreſſed by σοφια; ſo that with reſpect to this the Jews could go to Plato for nothing more than the mere word *Logos* itſelf to which he attributed the ſame meaning and character as the Old Teſtament did to *Sophia*: there cannot then be the leaſt pretence to conſider this exalted ſenſe of Logos as containing any Platonic tinge; for it was originally the very ſenſe diſplayed in the Old Teſtament. But with reſpect to the *popular* ſenſe of Logos, as meaning *diſcourſe*, it appears by ſome evidence ſtill extant, that through a natural metonymy it obtained in the vulgar language both of Greeks and Jews the ſecondary meaning of a *meſſenger*, who delivered a *diſcourſe* containing a meſſage of words,

inſtead

inſtead of ſignifying the *diſcourſe* or words themſelves.

Thus a paſſage in Phurnutus ſhews both the fact and alſo how naturally this ſecondary ſenſe aroſe from the primary one.* In another paſſage likewiſe he calls dreams *the meſſengers of the gods*, where inſtead of αγγελοι he might have employed Λογοι, as at p. 148, I have ſhewn, that Plutarch actually does in the ſame ſenſe of a *ſpirit*, *angel*, or divine *meſſenger*, which appeared to men as a viſible repreſentative of the god Oſiris. Agreeably to theſe Greek teſtimonies Philo informs us, that the Jews alſo, probably in imitation of the Greeks, gave the name of Logoi to angels in the vulgar language of the populace at leaſt[ſee p. 147]. But theſe divine meſſengers were not always of a *viſible* kind, as angels were ſuppoſed to be; yet they were always the objects of human perception in ſome mode or other, juſt as we have ſeen that Phurnutus calls *dreams* Deorum angeli; and as Philo gives the name of *Logoi* not only to angels,

* "Mercurius autem eſt *ſermo* [Λογος] quem ad nos dii miſerunt, hominem ſolum omnium animalium *ſermocinantem* facti—dictus eſt etiam Hermes a verbo ερειν quod eſt *loqui* [λεγειν]—eſt autem Deorum *nuntius* [αγγελος] ſiquidem *ſermonis* auxilio voluntatem divinam cognoſcimus." *De natur. Deor. c.* 16.

but

but alſo to other objects of perception, which teſtified the preſence, and agency of the Deity, ſuch as the extraordinary production of manna, and the ſtream iſſuing on a ſudden from a rock in the wilderneſs. Plutarch apparently has included all theſe different claſſes of divine meſſengers, which teſtified to the exiſtence, preſence or agency of the Deity, under one or other of theſe three appellations Λογοι, Ειδη, Απορροαι, i. e. audible *words*, viſible *forms* and perceptible *emanations*; which expreſſions in ſome degree become explanatory of each other, as all denote ſome acts or objects, which popular ſuperſtition had been accuſtomed to conſider as *tokens* or *ſenſible annunciations* of ſome unſeen Deity. The Λογοι were properly of an *audible kind*, ſuch as ſtrange unintelligible voices or ſignificant words, or merely thunder and ſuch others: The Ειδη were appearances under *viſible forms*, ſuch as angels, ſpectres and apparitions, or meteors, ſuch as a pillar of fire in the clouds, or a flame of fire in a buſh: The Απορροαι were mere *emanations* from influencies or operations cauſed by divine Power, ſuch as lightning, dreams, the production of manna, or a ſudden ſtream from a rock, or any other extraordinary effect,

effect, which might ſeem to teſtify the preſence or agency of divine Power. Yet vulgar language would doubtleſs often confound the propriety of ſuch appellations; and hence *Logoi* might be uſed to denote both viſible angels and alſo (as Philo does actually employ it) the production of manna and the ſtream from the rock: but at the ſame time we hence learn through what connexion of ideas it was, that the above word came to ſignify both thoſe claſſes of divine meſſengers, or annunciations of God's agency: ſo again Απορροαι ſeems to have been ſometimes diverted from its proper ſenſe in order to ſignify viſible *forms**. This ſingular paſſage then of Plutarch agrees with Philo in aſcertaining the uſe of *Logoi* in this popular ſenſe among the Greeks as well as Jews, in Egypt at leaſt; but this was a ſenſe in which it was never uſed by Plato or any Greek philoſophers; ſo that there can be no pretence to call even this a Platonic tinge. The caſe was nearly ſimilar to that of *tongue* in Engliſh, which means not only the *lan-*

* As we may collect from the ſubjoined words of Laertius. Ειδωλων [δαιμονων] πληρη ειναι τον αερα, κατ' απορροιαν υπο αναθυμιασεως εισκρινομενων ταις οψεσι των οξυδερκων. *In proem.*

*guage,*

*guage*, but alſo the *member* which utters it. But the Jews having always had an inclination to aſſimilate Jewiſh theology to Platoniſm, in order to vindicate themſelves from Atheiſm, they ſometimes ſtrained the words of Plato and ſometimes thoſe of their own ſcriptures in order to make them ſeem to meet amicably, as exhibiting the ſame doctrine. Hence becauſe the word *Logos* was found both in Plato, and in their own vulgar language, although it had a very different ſenſe in the two, yet they applied it in both ſenſes to one and the ſame divine Agent, whom they called the chief and moſt antient Logos; and whom they repreſented alternately, as being both the *divine Sophia* of their own ſcriptures (the Logos of Plato) and alſo an *angel*, and mere ſubordinate *meſſenger* of the Deity agreeably to their own ſenſe of Logos: thus one of the angels obtained that ſtrange, ambiguous and double character in Philo, of being both the *creating wiſdom* of God, and alſo a *created agent*; and hereby it is exhibited as ſuſtaining an intermediate rank between God and angels, and as the chief *mediator* between God and man. But neither is any thing of this to be found in Plato; the true Platonic and exalted ſenſe

of

of Logos ever exiſted in ſcripture originally under the name of *Sophia*; and this inferior ſuperadded ſenſe of it among the Jews was borrowed by them and Philo from the vulgar ſenſe, which Logos had obtained among the Greek and Jewiſh populace, not from Platoniſm; ſo that upon the whole it may be more properly ſaid, that Philo *vulgarized*, than that he *Platonized*.* Hence then has ariſen that incoherence, which runs through all the accounts of the Logos by Philo; for by his thus employing Logos, ſometimes in the ſcrip-

* Here I may obſerve, how much Le Clerc miſled his readers, when he ſuggeſted, that Plato, like Philo, gives the appellation of Λογους to *Deos inferiores* "ait Plato mentem [i. e. Νουν vel Λογον] eſſe omnium diviniſſimam, quia *alias* mentes ſeu Λογους eſſe putabat, Deos inferiores." *Epiſt. crit.* 7. But Plato never ſaid or thought of any ſuch thing as giving the name of *Logos* to angels or any inferior divine beings: yet Fabricius has copied this error of Le Clerc "angelos *Platonicorum more* Λογους appellat Philo" *De Platoniſmo Philonis. Sect.* 10.—So again Le Clerc erroneouſly aſcribes the idea of a *mediator* to Plato's Logos "unde Philo incidit in eam cogitationem de munere *mediatoris*, quod Logo tribuit? nempe *ex notione Platonica* naturæ Λογου, quæ media eſt inter Deum et creaturas." *Epiſt. crit.* 8. Yet the real fact is, that this idea of a mediator in the Logos was taken by Philo ſolely from Jewiſh theology, and the vulgar ſenſe of Logos among the Jewiſh populace, not from Plato.

tural Platonic and *philoſophic* ſenſe, and ſometimes in the vulgar and *popular* ſenſe of the word among the Jews, it is alternately exalted to the higheſt degree of divinity or elſe depreſſed to the ſubordinate character of a mere created agent and angel. The conſequence of this has been, that while ſome authors appeal to paſſages in Philo, wherein he deſcribes the Logos agreeably to the Gnoſtic and Arian idea of it, as being a ſubordinate divinity; others are able equally to appeal to other paſſages, wherein it approaches nearly to the exalted conception of it in Chriſtian orthodoxy: and doubtleſs for the reaſons abovementioned each party may find ſome account in Philo to countenance the opinion of each. Thus have I traced out the origin of the incoherence in Philo's works concerning this ſubject; which, as we have ſeen, ariſes from his application of the name Logos to one and the ſame agent, but in two different and incompatible ſenſes, namely both in the *philoſophic* and in the *popular* ſenſe of the word: Neither did this incoherence prevail in Philo's writings only, but it was brought likewiſe by the Jewiſh Chriſtians into Chriſtianity and communicated to the Greek Fathers. Of this we find repeated traces in

Juſtin

Juſtin Martyr; whereby while Dr. Bull produces paſſages to prove him to be an Athanaſian, Whitby equally produces others to ſhew him to be an Arian; and thus again Jewiſh theology has proved the ſource of the chief diſputes between Chriſtian ſectaries. Hence alſo the Greek Fathers, through a want in the Unitarians of candid attention to hiſtoric facts, have been erroneouſly accuſed of Platoniſm, when their chief failing has been that of imbibing too deep a tinge of Jewiſh theology along with their Chriſtian principles; and even that tinge itſelf was not acquired by the Jews from Platoniſm, but from the popular ſenſe of Logos and the current notions of the Jewiſh people; who did indeed attempt to aſſimilate their own theologic notions to Platoniſm, but this attempt however in *this* article produced nothing except incoherence, and an example how much an affectation of philoſophy often ſpoils common ſenſe, and confounds the meaning of common language. If Philo then had always adhered to the Platonic ſenſe of Logos as meaning the *divine wiſdom* of ſcripture, there would have been no ground for accuſation againſt him, as he would have only adopted the philoſophic and Platonic *word* inſtead of the ſcriptural

one *Sophia:* or again, if he had always adhered to the popular ſenſe of Logos among the Jews as meaning *an angel*, he would have been again blameleſs; but by applying *Logos* in both its ſenſes to one and the ſame agent or angel, whom he hereby made ſuperior to the reſt, he by this intermixture lowered the exalted character of *divine wiſdom* in ſcripture down to the idea of a created angel; and thus laid the foundation for the Gnoſtic and Arian notion of a ſubordinate divinity in the Logos both of the Jews and Chriſtians. But this (as I have ſhewn) was an incoherence and corruption derived ſolely from the Jews and their own theology, not from Platoniſm: Plato has however his ſubordinate divinitie, but they formed a totally different claſs from the Logos, and are always ſtiled by him δαιμονες or genii, the ſame as by Heſiod and all other Greek poets and writers; theſe were the *angeli* of the Jews; but it is abſurd in ſome authors to ſuggeſt, that Philo or the Jews borrowed their knowledge of theſe from Plato, they being coeval with the Old Teſtament; and if they had not, yet Philo might juſt as well have borrowed his ideas concerning them from any other Greek author as from Plato, or elſe in general

neral from the current popular opinions of all heathen nations in Aſia or elſewhere. So that upon the whole, there is nothing concerning Philo's doctrine of the Logos, which either Le Clerc and Fabricius have, or which any other can, prove him to have borrowed from Plato, except the *philoſophic ſenſe* of Logos given to the Jewiſh *word*, together with his notion, that in faſhioning the world, the Logos or divine wiſdom conformed itſelf to an imitation of the aboriginal *ideas* or patterns of worldly objects produced by the energy of the ſupreme Father: all the reſt is pure Jewiſh theology; and it can therefore no more be ſaid with truth, that the Greek Fathers borrowed from Plato the *ſubſtance* of their Chriſtian doctrine of the Logos *circuitouſly* through the Jews, than that they borrowed it *directly* from Plato himſelf. And even if it ſhould be true, that a Platonic tinge in a few *circumſtances* had adhered to this doctrine in Jewiſh theology (ſuch as that concerning aboriginal ideas) and that the Jewiſh Chriſtians tranſmitted theſe into Chriſtianity along with the doctrine of Chriſt, as appears by the writings of ſome of the firſt Greek Fathers: Yet if their ſucceſſors, Athanaſius or others removed theſe erroneous Platonic tinges, and alſo corrected

corrected the debaſing notion of Jewiſh theology which reduced the Logos to the ſubordinate nature of a great created angel, they thereby deſerved well of the Chriſtian world as the purifiers of Chriſtianity from all Jewiſh as well as Platonic corruptions which had adhered to it in its infancy, inſtead of being calumniated as the introducers of Platoniſm into Chriſtianity. So much have thoſe pretended lovers of truth the philoſophic Unitarians either miſtaken or miſrepreſented the true ſtate of facts in Chriſtian antiquity, in their accuſation of the firſt Greek Fathers as having introduced Platonic opinions into Chriſtianity with reſpect to any thing relative to the *ſubſtance* of the Chriſtian tenet of the divine Logos! As ſtrange a fate has Philo alſo met with, in being accuſed on one ſide of borrowing his Logos from Plato, and on the other of ſtealing it from Chriſtianity, rather than what is more natural of adopting the opinions of his own nation.

# AN APPENDIX
## TO THE
## FOURTH VOLUME
## OF
## Critical Obſervations on Books,
## ANTIENT and MODERN.

Containing a DEFENCE of the Evidence collected there, in Proof, that no ſuch Chriſtians ever exiſted, except in Utopia, during the firſt two Centuries, as thoſe whom Dr. Prieſtley calls Antient Unitarians, that is, who were not Believers in the Divinity of the Chriſt, in ſome Mode or other: Together with another curious Specimen of Romance in his late Hiſtory of the early Opinions concerning Chriſt, in regard to Plotinus being made, by him, to inſtruct the firſt Chriſtian Fathers in the Platonic Catechiſm, a whole Century before Plotinus was born.

Ει τις γαρ βυλοιτο φιλαληθως και μη φιλεριστως ζητειν τα θεια δογματα ευρησει τηλαυγεστατην την αληθειαν.—Nam, ſi quis veritatis ſtudio & non contentionis cauſa velit divina inquīrere dogmata, is quidem liquidiſſimè veritatem invenire poterit. *Origen contra Marcionitas. Sect.* 3.

---

### *The general Nature and Conſequences of a Spirit of Diſputation.*

THE ſpirit of diſputation is like a magic glaſs, which inverts the whole creation; that is no longer light, which we ſee, nor that real ſubſtance which we feel; it teaches us to doubt even our own exiſtence; all the attainments of human ſcience, all the antient traditions of religion, all the memorials of written

hiſtory, all the ſlow and accumulated knowledge of paſt ages, are made to diſappear like a viſion, are diſplaced, diſtorted, or annihilated, whenever they ſtand in the way of a new and favourite hypotheſis; which has been haſtily, perhaps, taken up at firſt by a falſe ſpirit of philoſophy, nurſed by the ſubtle ſpirit of metaphyſics, and defended by a wrangling ſpirit of diſputation; all of theſe ſufficient enemies to Truth, to be both able and willing to disfigure every feature of it, and this alſo even in the very moment, when the moſt flattering promiſes are made of an inviolable attachment to Truth, and Truth only*. Thus is the whole courſe of nature put out of joint by the arts of controverſy; rivers are made to run backwards and taint the fountains, whence they aroſe; new Sects, never heard of in Chriſtian Antiquity, are brought into being at the word of command; and Heathen Philoſophers have exiſtence beſtowed upon them a whole century before they were really born, in order that they might be old enough to teach the Platonic catechiſm to the firſt chriſtian fathers; ſo that literally, according to the words of Iſaiah, a new earth and a new heaven are created for chriſtian men. Such

* "Above all let Truth be our great object: our readers will eaſily perceive whether it be ſo or not; we ſhall ſooner deceive ourſelves than them."

*Preface to Lett. to Dr. Horſely, Part* 3. p. 7.

"Your noble intrepidity in following Truth, wherever you apprehend it to lead you, will always, I hope, increaſe my own zeal and firmneſs in the ſame cauſe."—*Dedication to Mrs. Rayner of the Hiſtory of early Opinions concerning Chriſt. p.* 6.

is a true picture of Dr. Prieſtley's *two Hiſtories* concerning the *antient* ſtate of Chriſtianity: and can Truth be either the *object* or the *conſequence* of enquiry, where the means employed to aſcertain it, are thus found of ſuch an objectionable kind? and where alſo the moſt ſerious enquiries after it are often interlarded with warm ejaculations, which betray a longing wiſh after *tythes, &c.*? Is this conſiſtent in thoſe, who profeſs *only* a regard for Truth?† Nevertheleſs, it is not merely in the eyes of the illiterate multitude, that miſrepreſentations do ſometimes meet with ſucceſs, but as often alſo among the better inſtructed part of men, in caſe they be not on their guard againſt the ſpecious gloſſes of no-

† "The moſt equitable thing would be to allow Unitarians the uſe of a church, when their proportion of the *tythes, &c.* would be ſufficient for the maintenance of a Miniſter of their own perſuaſion."—*Dr. Prieſtley's Sermon on Free Enquiry in Religion, p.* 44.—But in another place Dr. P. on the contrary ſays as follows: "All who are intereſted in the ſupport of theſe Anti-Chriſtian eſtabliſhments, which uſurp an undue authority over the conſciences of men, and whoſe wealth and power are advanced by them, are in a ſtate of conſternation." *Sermon at Leeds*, 1773.—By a compariſon of the above two paſſages, it appears, that Dr. P. would not conſider eſtabliſhments as *Anti-chriſtian*, in caſe the *power and wealth* of the Unitarians *were advanced by them*; and that ſuch an eſtabliſhment would not be to *uſurp* an *undue* authority over the conſciences of men: For what authority has orthodox eſtabliſhment at preſent over the conſciences of men, except the influence ariſing from what he elſewhere calls "the preſent *excluſive advantages* of eſtabliſhment."—*Sermon on Free Enquiry, p.* 45.

velty, and in caſe they do not examine the reality of facts, the right ſenſe of the words of authors, and the ſolidity of arguments, before they proceed to judgment. It is but too certain likewiſe, that notwithſtanding all the boaſted force of Truth, it lies under great *diſadvantages* in ſeveral reſpects, otherwiſe indeed men could never have been ſo long diſputing where to find it ‡: For there is a natural diſpoſition in men to find fault with the underſtanding of their religious teachers, juſt as with that of their civil governors, becauſe all the reſt of men are moſt ſupremely wiſe. It is moreover always eaſier in every ſubject, to find *ſome* room for cenſure and difference in opinion, than to vindicate every ſubject from *all* apparent ground for it; and a few dextrous miſrepreſentations of words and facts, may require the labour of many pages before they can be ſet in their true light again; as has been ſufficiently proved by my *obſervations* already, in regard to merely literary as well as religious ſubjects: in both of theſe caſes the prejudices and paſſions of men intereſt themſelves ſo very warmly, that the moſt zealous enquirers after Truth often become loſt upon an ocean of Confuſion, and their patience tired out in the endleſs purſuits, which a talent for diſputation is able to prepare for them. Truth may indeed ſometimes come out at laſt, but it is generally drawn out with as much difficulty, as Melibæus in Virgil draws his innocent

‡ "Truth will always have an *infinite advantage* over Error, if free ſcope be given to enquiry."—*Dr. Prieſtley's Sermon on Free Enquiry in Religion, p.* 18.

lamb

lamb along, *quem vix vi, Tityre, duxit:* and if Truth ſhould happily riſe up with vigour at laſt, yet this is but a poor conſolation for thoſe who have previouſly received many unjuſt imputations of ignorance and impoſition from the miſrepreſentations of Falſeood; ſo that, upon the whole, Truth generally comes too late out of the hands of Diſputation, either to recommend or even to juſtify its votaries until a ſubſequent generation. Truth may, indeed, have never been conquered by Power, but it has been often held in ſubjection during many ages, by the fallacious arts of Controverſy §. *Free* enquiry, therefore, forms no ſufficient protection for Truth, without a *fair* enquiry; becauſe Truth is *ſimple* and *ſingle*, whereas Error may be combined into an infinite number of forms; ſo that few perſons will have either perſeverance enough in themſelves, or regard enough for the beauty of Truth, to ſearch it out amidſt that vaſt wilderneſs of obſtructions, which the dexterity of diſputatious Error can raiſe up to conceal it, by an artificial combination of *many* words. Accordingly, this is a commendation which Dr. P. takes to himſelf, in that "he has written *much* in the way of religious controverſy ‖; but had he written *leſs*, and attended *much more* to the reality of facts, the meaning of authors, and the conſiſtency of his own reaſoning, he might have made, perhaps, ſome real addition to the ſmall pittance of human knowledge in this re-

§ "Truth has never yet been conquered by Power."—*Sermon on Free Enquiry in Religion, p.* 47.

‖ Preface to Sermon on Free Enquiry.

ligious ſubject, as he has commendably done in natural ones, inſtead of having, on the contrary, too often contributed to diſtract, perplex, and obſcure ſtill more the true ſtate of Chriſtian antiquity. In one point, however, the public is indebted to Dr. P. by his having now collected his ſcattered and diſjointed opinions concerning Chriſtian Antiquity, into a more regular ſeries, and included them in *one* work, namely, in his new '*Hiſtory of early Opinions concerning Chriſt*,' which may be conſidered as the *code of Unitarianiſm*: for before this we could not be always certain what opinions Dr. P. meant to maintain, and therefore were the leſs able to diſcern and to diſplay their inconſiſtency with themſelves, as well as with hiſtory; but now, by their being thus exhibited in more open day-light, the weakneſs of their foundation will be more eaſily diſcovered. He promiſes himſelf, however, that "this Work will blow up ſuch a flame as will not, he truſts, be extinguiſhed, till its end be effectually anſwered *." Thoſe who patronized infidelity at the commencement of this century, promiſed themſelves the very ſame ſucceſs; and ſo have the profeſſors of every new hereſy in this and every former age; yet time has ſhewn how different the end of thoſe innovators has been from their too confident hopes of ſucceſs at the beginning; and where they have in any degree ſucceeded, yet it has been through a peculiar combination of worldly circumſtances, and not through the ſo-

* Letter to Dr. H. Part 3. p. 48.

lidity

lidity of their intellectual arguments or hiſtoric evidence.

Now out of this huge maſs of hiſtorical, critical, metaphyſical, and philoſophical Romance, which Dr. Prieſtley has thus collected together into *his two Hiſtories*; together with his Tracts in defence of them, lately augmented into four volumes in octavo, I had ſelected only a *ſingle* ſubject for my own *obſervations*; having expreſsly confined myſelf to enquire concerning the following *ſingle fact*, viz. Whether there be any ſufficient evidence extant in the Chriſtian Fathers, or elſewhere, that any *one* claſs of *Sectaries* during the firſt two centuries, had been believers in the mere humanity of that being or perſon, whom they conſidered as *the Chriſt* *. This confined ſubject of my enquiries I have not only ſignified in the title page to my *Remarks on the Fathers*, in this 4th volume, but alſo afterwards, at *p.* 8 and 15, I have expreſsly reſtrained myſelf merely to form a kind of *Supplement* to what the public is already poſſeſſed of, and this relative only to the abovementioned *ſingle* article, and ſuch other queſtions as are cloſely connected with it; it being a ſubject, which has never been hitherto ſufficiently at-

* When I uſe the phraſe of *the Chriſt*, it is in order to prevent an ambiguity, which often occurs in the Fathers, who make no diſtinction between *the Chriſt*, and that particular perſon, whom they call *Jeſus Chriſt*; whereas many of the Sectaries conſidered *Jeſus* and *the Chriſt* as different beings, the former as being merely human, and the latter as being divine: they did not therefore believe *Jeſus* to be *the Chriſt*, until the latter became united to him at baptiſm.

tended to by former writers, who have too readily conceded, or rather acquieſced without enquiry in the confident aſſertions of the Unitarians, that there *did* exiſt in the firſt two Chriſtian ages *ſome* Sects, who diſbelieved the divinity of Chriſt: this ill-founded opinion our preſent Unitarians have extended ſtill farther, namely, to *all* Chriſtian Sects of thoſe times, except the Gnoſtics, and even to the common people among the *orthodox* likewiſe; and hence they have taken occaſion to conclude, that the doctrine of Humaniſm was the original Chriſtianity. Now if, in contradiction to this, I ſhew that Dr. Prieſtley has not and cannot fix upon any *one* Chriſtian *Sect* of the firſt ages (as I defy him to do) whom he can prove to have diſbelieved in the divinity of *the Chriſt*; and if others have ſhewn, as Dr. Horſeley has done in part, and as may be confirmed ſtill more plainly, that there is no hiſtoric evidence extant, that *any* either of the common people or teachers among thoſe, who called themſelves *orthodox*, were believers in the mere humanity of the Chriſt, then there is an end at once to this famous *hiſtoric* argument of Dr. Prieſtley, for the *certainty* of the mere humanity of Chriſt, drawn from the pretended *antiquity* and *univerſality* of the belief of it in the firſt Chriſtian ages. Dr. Prieſtley has often aſſerted, that the errors, of which he has been convicted, do not affect any *eſſential* parts of his principles; this is certainly by no means true; yet he has repeated the ſame aſſertion in the Preface to his *new Hiſtory:* "I am confident, that all my overſights will not invalidate any poſition of conſequence in the whole work,"

work," *p.* 12. But the abovementioned two articles, if proved againſt him, ſtrike directly at the very foundation of *all* his poſitions of any conſequence. Yet why do I ſay, *proved againſt him*, the burden lies upon his own ſhoulders to bring *proofs* from Hiſtory, that there ever exiſted among the *ſectaries* and *orthodox* any claſſes of Chriſtians, who diſbelieved in the divinity of Chriſt; which he neither has done, nor can do: all that is incumbent on me is to ſhew, that the *evidence* which he *has* already *produced* is not ſufficient for that purpoſe; if for no other reaſon, yet at leaſt for this, that he has *entirely omitted* much ſtronger hiſtoric evidence to the contrary: Is this an *overſight of no conſequence?* For inſtance, he has never, until *now*, taken the *leaſt notice* of that very particular account in Epiphanius, concerning the belief of the Ebionites in the divinity of *the Chriſt*, though confirmed by Tertullian, as I have ſhewn in my *Diſcourſe*, and in the Preface to my *Remarks on the Fathers*. When, therefore, he adds, "That he has not *knowingly overlooked* any paſſage that promiſed to throw light on the ſubject," *p.* 10; this aſſertion is no farther true than with reſpect to the word *knowingly*; the public may poſſibly give him credit, that it was done *careleſsly*, eſpecially ſince he informs us, "that he has peruſed all the books contained in his annexed catalogue (and among the reſt Epiphanius and Tertullian) with *as much care*, as he thought the nature of each required," *ibid.* A profeſſed and prejudiced diſputant will naturally produce only what makes in his favour; but a fair enquirer will equally produce what makes againſt him, and give

give his readers opportunity to judge, whether he is able or not to remove the force of it. Here then I muſt leave it to himſelf to reconcile his aſſertions with the above facts. With reſpect to myſelf, I have never undertaken or propoſed ſo vaſt a work as his, it having been my declared intention to confine myſelf to a *ſingle article*, namely, the *former* of the two abovementioned articles, which reſpects the belief of the *Sectaries*; though I may poſſibly now exceed my propoſal a little, and add a *few* remarks concerning the *latter* article alſo, which reſpects the belief of the common people among the *orthodox* during the firſt two centuries. What then could induce Dr. Prieſtley to depart from Truth in his *Laſt Remarks*, by inſinuating to his readers "that we ſhall now [in *my* remarks] ſee *all* that *can* be produced againſt his argument? *p.* 64. Patience forbid, that I ſhould undertake ſuch a tireſome taſk; for, in truth, I find in almoſt every page of his *new Hiſtory*, as well as in his former Tracts, ſuch a multitude of errors and contradictions, as would occupy all my life to exhibit to the public: and I have diſcoveries of more importance to ſacred literature to communicate, when I can find leiſure to commit them to paper, than by engaging in the drudgery of refuting again what has been already refuted; or elſe what is ſo obviouſly erroneous or inconſiſtent, as to ſtand in no need of refutation. But how can the public place any confidence in his aſſertions concerning Chriſtian antiquity, or in the ſenſe he gives to words in Scripture, when he thus attributes to me a propoſal directly contrary to my repeated and recent declarations?

Dr.

Dr. Prieſtley departs from Truth again, when he mentions my hiſtoric inveſtigation of the belief of the Ebionites in the divinity of Chriſt, as being only a *favourite hypotheſis* of my own, a curious *aſſertion*, a *ſingular* poſition; for in reality, it has been *noticed* by ſeveral writers before, although none of them have indeed enquired concerning it with ſufficient minuteneſs, nor extended the ſame belief to other Chriſtian *Sectaries* of the firſt two centuries, as they ought to have done †.

Neither has Dr. Prieſtly only thus departed from Truth with reſpect to what I have *propoſed to do* in regard to this ſubject, but alſo with reſpect to what I *have already done* in both ſacred and prophane ſubjects; and ſtill farther, even with reſpect to what he himſelf *has already ſaid*. He aſſerts, for inſtance, in his *Laſt Remarks*,

† "Epiphanius ſpeaking of *ſome* of the Ebionites (who were near allied to the Cerinthians [Gnoſtics], and borrowed much of their doctrine) ſays, That they ſuppoſed *their Chriſt* to have deſcended from Heaven." *Waterland on the Trinity*, *p.* 249. Waterland here refers this belief of the divinity of Chriſt only to *ſome* of the Ebionites. Dr. Prieſtley has made the ſame miſtake at *p.* 87. If both of them had not read Epiphanius or quoted him careleſsly, they would have perceived, that what Epiphanius refers to only *ſome* of the Ebionites, was a very different article of belief, and not that of the divinity of the Chriſt, which was common to them all.—Dr. Prieſtley ought to have remembered alſo that Dr. Horſeley had *noticed* that, "Ebion in his notions of the Redeemer ſeems to have been a mere Cerinthian." *Firſt Letters to Dr. P. p.* 82. So far is it from being true, that mine is a *ſingular* poſition. *v. alſo p.* 22.

"that

" that *talent of diſputation* is, in like manner, a favourite phraſe of my own;" (*p.* 56.) but in fact the phraſe originated with Dr. Prieſtley himſelf; I have only echoed back to him again, and I thought that, without my writing a name under the picture, he would have known his own again, and his own former acknowledgement of it's being a favourite habit ‡. He adds, towards the cloſe of *thoſe* Remarks, " That if it was my ſerious opinion, that no good ever aroſe from (the talent of diſputation); how can I juſtify myſelf for engaging in a controverſy, in which I am entirely a volunteer; and how comes it, that every thing I have written is controverſial: Both my *obſervations* on Books and *Sermon* are altogether ſuch?" *p.* 64. I'll tell him how; although I have indeed, in part, already obviated theſe queſtions in the *Preface* to my Remarks on the Fathers: but I may now add farther, in proof of my being no controverſial writer, that I have always diſdained all the arts of controverſy, as well as the language of it. Dr. Prieſtley will find in my *Obſervations* no military phraſes concerning *volunteers*, *attacks*, *opponents*, *antagoniſts*, *adverſaries*, and *enemies*, nor any others, which tend to debaſe the cauſe of Literature, or to increaſe the warmth of religious differences with the language of fierce gladiators. Such language may be ſuitable to the party zeal of a Sectary, who makes it his buſineſs to fight againſt eſtabliſhments, unleſs he can partake of them; as I have ſhewn from

‡ " I hope we ſhall be preparing for that world, where a Talent for Diſputation will be of no uſe." *Dedication to Mr. Lindſey of Hiſt. of Corrupt. p.* 9.

his

his own words, that Dr. Prieſtley wiſhes to do: but this is not conſiſtent with my own views or practice, any more than with the enlarged views of one, who profeſſes himſelf a Philoſopher, as Dr. Prieſtley's Title-page ſets forth in full ſhew; although, indeed, little will be found within correſpondent to real philoſophy, except *hard* words *. Had he then ſcrupulouſly conſulted philoſophic Truth, he could no more have aſſerted, that I had been a *controverſial opponent* to any man, than that I had been a flatterer of any man or woman in *dedications*: my lucubrations have not only been intitled, but have alſo in reality conſiſted merely of obſervations on *books*, not *authors*; in which, however, I have neither been wanting to bring forth to light judicious remarks by authors hid in obſcurity, nor yet to ſuggeſt errors in thoſe, who may have the public voice in their favour. I have therefore been, in fact, what I have profeſſed to be, a mere *obſerver* of the miſtakes committed in the controverſial warfare of others; but who at the ſame time regretted, that their learned animoſities ſhould have rendered them blind to Truth themſelves, or have been the means to prevent its being diſcovered by the by-ſtanders: for the benefit then of theſe, I took upon me the labour of penning down my own remarks in reading (as I wiſh all others would do), and thus became a neutral inveſtigator of various truths, ſacred and pro-

* *Hiſtory of early Opinions*, by J. Prieſtley, L L. F. R. S. Ac. Imp. Petrop. R. Paris. Holm. Taurin. Aurel. Med. Paris. Cantab. Americ. et Philad. Socius.

phane,

phane, which had too unhappily been involved in very intricate and almoſt inexplicable labyrinths by the arts of Controverſy; where both Truth and Error have been ſhewn by me to have been alternately on the ſide of each, and each combatant ſucceſſively proſtrate on the ground. Amidſt this mortifying ſcene to human learning, to unbiaſſed Reaſon alone have *my Dedications* been addreſſed, in order to ſhew it by what means, and to adviſe it by all means, to make a generous effort to extricate itſelf from the ſhackles of learned authority, from the ſubtleties of confident diſputants, and from all the deſperate art of words; which have now for ſo many ages had ſucceſs enough to blindfold one half of mankind, and to deceive the other: hereby it is that they have been with-held from properly exerting their own underſtandings; which might otherwiſe have long ago enabled them to aſcend up to that region of harmony, where the Sun of Truth may be ſeen ſhining in all its brightneſs. I may have been *ſingular* then in tracing out this new path, a path never frequented by *controverſial writers*; whoſe endeavour it has always been to exhibit in a ſtrong light, only one ſide of every ſubject, and to hide the other in total darkneſs, as Dr. Prieſtley himſelf has done with reſpect to the tenets of the Ebionites: yet I hope, that I ſhall not be the laſt to purſue this track, or to approve it. Few however, too few, perhaps, may be inclined along with myſelf, to ſearch for Truth with caution and candour, or to embrace it when diſcovered; therefore it has been for *the few* alone, that my *obſervations* have been calculated:

from

from thoſe, who bring religious or diſputatious prejudices along with them, I can expect no good; if while they oſtenſibly profeſs the cauſe of Truth only, they bring with them a lurking envy at the emoluments of the eſtabliſhed Church; and though called by Elijah to follow him to heaven, if they have their thoughts ſtill fixed upon earth, upon unyoking the oxen, and partaking of *the tythes, &c.* all ſuch, before they approach the hallowed ground of Truth, muſt firſt put off the old man, that is corrupt according to deceitful luſts, and be renewed in the ſpirit of a right underſtanding, both to will and to do according to the good motions of *Reaſon*. It is not in the power of evidence, argument, or eloquence, to force Truth upon the ſight of ſuch, as ſhall be thus determined either not to ſee it themſelves, or to miſrepreſent it to others †. It is then to the willing volunteers only, that Reaſon wiſhes to ſpeak, or to whom it can hope to ſpeak with any good effect; and a ſevere reproach it is to all controverſial writers, that no reader can truſt to their fidelity any more than to their care and diſcernment through a whole page together, nor even for the ſenſe of any ſingle quotation. My *Diſcourſe*, therefore, and my *Obſervations* on Books, have both of them been directed in a conſiſtent manner to the very ſame end; and that not a *controverſial one*, as Dr.

† An oracle of Dr. Prieſtley's own—Mr. Wakefield has juſtly obſerved, "That when an argument has been once exhibited with a clearneſs ſufficient to call forth the attention of an ingenuous enquirer, all beyond this is an unavailing ſacrifice to prejudice." *Introd. to Enquiry on Chriſtian Opinions, p.* 22.

Prieſtley

Prieſtley unjuſtly aſſerts, but quite the contrary, namely, to exhibit the unſolid principles, the falſe aſſertions, the weak reaſonings, the defective proofs and erroneous concluſions of all controverſial writers, on the one ſide, as well as the other, of any ſubject which fell under my conſideration: hereby it has appeared, that oppoſite parties, when engaged in altercation concerning merely literary as well as religious queſtions, have all of them equally miſtaken the words of authors, and miſrepreſented the ſtate of facts; ſo that in many important parts of human knowledge, both ſacred and prophane, a ſincere enquirer is ſtill as much at a loſs as ever where to ſeek for Truth, when he wiſhes to find it, or where to meet with a faithful guide to conduct him in his journey without deception. For this inconvenience, we are chiefly indebted to the arts, the prejudices, and partialities of public diſputers; whoſe chief concern it has been to recommend their own pretences to learning, or excuſe their fondneſs for ſome new and fanciful ſyſtem, although at the expence of their own reaſon and fidelity. We muſt then even ſtill depend upon the exerciſe of our own underſtandings, and upon our own *obſervations*, in order to determine our judgments; which is now rendered much more difficult than originally by the many miſrepreſentations of all parties: for we have now not only to ſearch for what is true, but alſo to refute what is erroneous; and theſe errors ſupported, moreover, by the authority of various writers of reputation. Theſe difficulties, nevertheleſs, do not place Truth in the ſituation, to which it

was

was condemned by the principles of the Academics, who maintained that there was no ſuch a thing as *certainty* to be found in human knowledge; on the contrary I conceive, that Truth is to be found even ſtill with ſufficient certainty to determine our judgments, in caſe it be but ſought for without prejudice and partiality; it is indeed to be found, yet hid and obſcured amidſt heaps of rubbiſh, from whence enquirers muſt themſelves pick it out gradually with care and caution, according as it may happen to catch their own eyes and attention. So that more difficulty ariſes now from artificial than from natural cauſes; and it is on this principle of having no other maſter than Reaſon, that the whole ſucceſs muſt depend. Accordingly, this is a method which I have long ago not only found neceſſary, but invariably purſued in my own ſtudies; and from a conviction of its utility, I have in my *obſervations* attempted to introduce it into public enquiries: but it will require both much time and patience to collect together into a connected ſyſtem of Truth the many disjointed parts of it, which lie ſcattered in many different authors; where they are at preſent overpowered by a multitude of Errors, among which they ſhine as lights of the world. It is the buſineſs then of impartial enquiry to collect together theſe ſcattered rays, juſt as in an optic glaſs, and to bring them in ſome orderly manner to be united in one focus; whereby they will be found able, not only to illuminate our paths in ſtudy, but alſo to excite a blaze of admiration at the beautiful and harmonious features of Truth. To this object my *diſcourſe*

tends to excite men in a more *general* manner; my *obſervations* have added a variety of *particular* examples to the ſame purport, in regard to Chronologers, Etymologiſts, Antiquarians, Compilers of Prophane Hiſtory, and Commentators on Scripture. The addition of a heterodox book was ſtill wanting in order to complete the circle of my commentaries on the detrimental conſequences of diſputation; and to ſhew, that books of this claſs, to the diſgrace of literature and liberty, exceed all the exceedings of error, prejudice, and inconſiſtency in others: no book more fruitful in apt examples of this fact could offer, than the *Hiſtory of Corruptions* in Chriſtianity, ſo far as reſpects the primitive ſtate of the Chriſtian Church; the numerous and incoherent errors concerning which ſubject disfigure every page both of the original and its defences. But I have never myſelf undertaken any thing more in proof of this, than to preſent the public with a *ſpecimen* relative to a ſingle fact; it is one however which forms a main pillar in Dr. Prieſtley's ſyſtem, and is the weak foundation of his whole ſuperſtructure. In caſe then any good ſhall ariſe from my *obſervations* on this ſubject, yet it will not be a conſequential good ariſing from controverſy itſelf; but quite the contary, it will be a good ariſing from my not being a controverſial writer; which has enabled me both to ſee Truth myſelf, to ſeparate it from Error, and not to hide either of them from the view of the public. Upon the whole, from the reſult of my reſearches it has appeared in part already, and will appear more and more, that Literature is

far

far from having arrived as yet to ſuch a ſtate of perfection, as to render it neceſſary for authors to have recourſe to fanciful ſyſtems and extraordinary inventions of imagination in order to diſplay ſomething new: for at every ſtep we tread in the moſt ordinary ſubjects, both ſacred and prophane, we find ourſelves even in this advanced period of learning ſtill ſurrounded on all ſides with doubts, errors, and contradictions, both of ſuch magnitude as well as multitude, that they perplex, if not overpower the few evident truths intermixed with them; and reduce a conſiderate reader nearly to the ſtate of an Academic, ſo that he ſcarcely knows what to believe as true. Truth indeed daily cries out to all with an urgent voice—remove, remove the load of controverſial errors, diſentangle the ſnares of diſputation, dogmatiſm and raſh conjectures, whether of a critical or philoſophical nature; yet notwithſtanding theſe remonſtrances we are overwhelmed with learned as well as unlearned romances, with hiſtorical, antiquarian, critical, metaphyſical, etymological, aſtronomical *, and now at laſt with Chriſtian romances: hereby almoſt all reliſh for truth is baniſhed from the minds of men, who have been ſo long humoured in this way, and are of themſelves ſo naturally inclined to the amuſement of novelties, that all parties ſeem readily to join with the Iſraelites in their exclamation to the falſe prophets, "Speak to

* See Lettres ſur l'Origine des Sciences & de l'Aſtronomie parmi les Peuples de l'Aſie, par M. Bailly, 1767.

us pleaſing things, propheſy deceits." To thoſe *few* readers who may not be ſo ready to run with the thoughtleſs crowd, but can ſtop and turn their courſe at the friendly admonition of "Quo rueris miſeri" to theſe only have my *Obſervations* been directed; in order to induce them to conſider, whether it be the part of true criticiſm, or real philoſophy, to be eternally ſhifting one's opinions, like the ſhort-lived faſhions of the times, without having any better reaſons for one mode than another; and whether ſuch haſty exchanges of error for error, can ever lead to the acquiſition of Truth at laſt, to the inſtruction of poſterity, or even to the real ſatisfaction of any writer himſelf in his own future meditations in private. The true ſtate of the caſe then is, that inſtead of my having ever been a controverſial writer, as Dr. Prieſtley affirms, I have on the contrary been one of theſe diſtreſſed readers, who have found myſelf at every ſtep perplexed and perſecuted by the arts, errors and chicanery of controverſial writers in various claſſes of knowledge; but inſtead of ſinking under the difficulties, with which they encompaſſed me on every ſide, I have often by dint of patience and attention been happy enough to find means of extricating myſelf from the wilderneſs into which they have miſled the public: Often indeed I have for a long time been able to find no way to eſcape; yet at laſt while I have been groping in the darkneſs they had ſpread around me, I have in moſt caſes been fortunate enough to diſcover ſome private, narrow, and concealed path, which had eſcaped the *obſervations* of all others;

and

and which, by being ſteadily purſued, I have found to lead into an open, plain, and unencumbered country, where Truth, Peace, and Harmony make their abode. Having thus luckily found the right paſſages whereby to creep out of the wilderneſs myſelf, I have attempted with pen and ink ſo to mark and deſcribe the paths I took, as that others may do the ſame; leſt theſe paſſages ſhould afterwards remain hidden from the eyes of all, and leſt the wilderneſs of Controverſy ſhould thicken by degrees, and at laſt cloſe up for ever theſe latent and hitherto undiſcovered roads to Truth. The nature of theſe diſcoveries I ſhall proceed to communicate to the public according as they can with propriety be introduced and connected together; whereby they will contribute to ſupport, confirm, and illuſtrate each other.

At preſent my object is to prevent the features of original Chriſtianity both among the *Sectaries* and *Orthodox* from being disfigured by philoſophic and metaphyſical romance. If Dr. Prieſtley is of opinion, that by the aſſiſtance and application of Philoſophy, he ſhall be able to introduce and recommend to mankind a more rational mode of Chriſtianity than that which has been received among orthodox Chriſtians; yet after ſuch alteration it will no longer be the antient Chriſtian religion, it will be Dr. Prieſtley's own new religion; and any other perſon may by the ſame means make any thing elſe of Chriſtianity which he pleaſes. With any project of this kind I have no other concern, than only that in the proſecution of it he makes uſe of reaſonable means, and ſuch as

are conſiſtent with Truth. Now I am convinced, that any plan of this kind muſt depend for ſupport upon itſelf and its own rational nature, not upon the antient ſtate of Chriſtianity at its origin; and it can never be deemed reaſonable to diſfigure and miſrepreſent that, in order to gain countenance and ſupport to this new plan from the pretended authority of antiquity; nor yet in conſequence of this firſt miſrepreſentation to ſubjoin a ſecond, by accuſing orthodox teachers down from the beginning of Chriſtianity of ignorance and impoſition in regard to the real ſenſe of Scripture and tenets of the firſt Chriſtians: this would be to pervert all the hiſtoric traces of Chriſtian Antiquity in order to render it ſubſervient to Dr. Prieſtley's new philoſophic mode of Religion; if indeed it can with propriety be ſaid to be of a really more philoſophic kind, than that it would diſplace; which in my opinion admits of much doubt. But how do we daily regret our ignorance of the originals of Polytheiſm in prophane antiquity! How often do we lament alſo to find ſo few of the originals even of Chriſtianity ſtill remaining at the end of 1800 years! And yet happily in this caſe we have many more materials preſerved, and an opportunity of getting a much better peep into antiquity, than with reſpect to prophane Polytheiſm. Who then, who wiſhes well to Literature, can abſtain from lamenting alſo, whenever they ſee any of the hiſtoric traces of the antient ſtate of Chriſtianity diſtorted and miſrepreſented, in order to ſerve the enthuſiaſtic purpoſes of a modern religious ſect, who ſtyle themſelves Unitarians; and whom

whom we find to be juſt as extravagantly inclined to preſs every thing into the ſervice of their own particular Chriſtian mode, as the firſt Chriſtian Fathers were into the ſervice of Chriſtianity in general? Thus while oſtenſibly they pretend to act upon philoſophic principles, they in reality only diſplay a different mode of exerting a blind and impetuous ſectarian zeal: and they daily commit the ſame ravages with their pens upon the venerable remains of Chriſtian Antiquity, which their predeceſſors, the Mahommedan Unitarians, did with fire and ſword, by deſtroying or mangling all the authentic memorials of the Chriſtian religion in antient ages; and this in order to favour the pretended high antiquity of their own modern Unitarian tenets; of the exiſtence of which I can in fact find no evidence before the age of Socinus, 1500 years after Chriſt, but at leaſt not in the firſt two centuries. Men of reaſon ought to reflect, that there are Antiquarian Societies of hiſtoric enquiry, as well as Unitarian Societies of religious belief; and whatever were either the antient Jews or antient Chriſtians in regard to their religious opinions, yet let them be delineated ſtrictly according to the Truth, and not according to the fanciful ſketches of a heated imagination: whether the antient Jews and Chriſtians were reaſonable or unreaſonable men, religious or ſuperſtitious, Unitarians or Polytheiſts, or in the middle between both, half Chriſtians and half Heathens; yet in no caſe let a fanatical ſpirit of envy at orthodoxy bury the few relics of Chriſtian Antiquity in the ruins of confuſion and miſrepreſentation; juſt as formerly a ſimilar fanatic ſpirit deſtroyed the

venerable buildings of Chriſtian piety. It will be always a ſufficient ſubject of commendation, both to Judaiſm and Chriſtianity, that they firſt laid the foundation of a rational religious belief, even although neither of them ſhould have ever brought it to perfection: let the modern Apoſtles do better if they can; yet without throwing unmerited dirt upon their primitive Chriſtian predeceſſors, who will have enough to do to anſwer for their real human failings, which interfered with their Chriſtian courſe. Thoſe maſter-builders who firſt laid and cemented the foundations of the Chriſtian building, do neither appear to have been ignorant nor intereſted workmen, although indeed they were not complete maſters in all kinds of erudition: but they can at leaſt ſay with a certain perſonage, "What! had we not virtues enough to atone for a few imperfections?" One would not wiſh then even the blots and imperfections of Chriſtian Antiquity to be wiped off with a too raſh and haſty hand, any more than the many awkward ornaments defaced from Gothic architecture; in however rude and vulgar a taſte either of them may have been formed in their original ſtate. Orthodox Chriſtianity is the vulgar Chriſtianity of the earlieſt ages, and there are no traces to be diſcovered in thoſe times of any other ſyſtem; excepting of ſuch as were invented by Sectaries, who through an affected contempt of vulgar Chriſtianity were miſled to introduce various refinements upon it; being urged to this by the very ſame motives as modern Unitarians, that is, under pretence of making philoſophic improvements in the Chriſtian Religion

gion. So that if orthodoxy was, as Dr. Prieſtley pronounces, nothing better than nonſenſe and abſurdity, yet it was at worſt thought antient and vulgar nonſenſe, not of a newly imported and philoſophic kind; all this philoſophic nonſenſe aroſe with the Sectaries, who were at firſt philoſophizing Jews and Samaritans (for ſuch were the firſt *Gnoſtics* and *Ebionites*) afterwards the ſame diſeaſe of philoſophic reformation ſpread among the Greeks, as Chriſtianity ſpread itſelf about the time of Theodotus at the end of the ſecond and beginning of the third century. Theſe all pretended to underſtand the Scriptures better than the vulgar Chriſtians; and what excellent improvements they made, a knowledge of their reſpective tenets will tell*: Theſe were the grand archetypes in the philoſophic way, of whom the modern Unitarians are the ſucceſſors and humble imitators; and who by their more novel rather than more reaſonable inventions of romance, promiſe to themſelves that they

* Εκασ‌τοτε οἱ απλουστεροι και περι τας Γραφας ανοητως φερομενοι, αλλως τα γεγραμμενα βελονται νοειν, ὁπερ αλογον. Qui *ſimpliciores* ſunt [viz. Orthodoxi] et in ſacris literis *inſipienter* verſantur, frequenter ea quæ ſcripta ſunt, aliter [quam par eſt] volunt intelligere; quod a ratione alienum eſt. *Orig. Dial. contra Marcionitas. Sect.* 3. Here we ſee, that the ſpeaker, one of the philoſophic Sectaries in the firſt ages, pretended like their ſucceſſors the modern Unitarians, that the believers in *vulgar* Chriſtianity were an *ignorant* ſet of people, who did not *underſtand* the Scriptures rightly; but at leaſt they are accuſed (we ſee) only of *vulgar nonſenſe*, not of any *philoſophic* nonſenſe; and this was the imperfection generally attributed to the Orthodox by the high philoſophic ſpirits of thoſe times,

ſhall

ſhall be able to produce in the preſent times the ſame altercations, diſunion and confuſion, which the antient philoſophizing Sectaries produced ſoon after the commencement of Chriſtianity.

---

## *Errors of Dr. Prieſtley concerning the Tenets of the Ebionites.—Proof from Tertullian ſupported.*

LET us now advance from *general* conſiderations concerning the Spirit of Diſputation to ſuch as relate to *particular* exertions of it. I have mentioned above one effect of the Spirit of Diſputation, which conſiſts in its inducing a writer neither to ſee himſelf nor to permit his readers to ſee any thing in any book,

who conſidered Orthodoxy as a belief only fit for the ignorant vulgar. So different was the defect imputed to it then from what it is now accuſed of by the Unitarians, as being the produce of metaphyſical philoſophy; yet the doctrine of the Trinity was then univerſally acknowledged by the Orthodox. Let us juſt obſerve farther, what it was that the above-mentioned Gnoſtic Sectary conſidered as proofs of *ignorance* in the Orthodox. Firſt ſays he, *Abſurdum cenſeo, malum a deo factum fuiſſe.* Secondly, *Verbum dei carnem humanam aſſumſiſſe.* Thirdly, *hanc carnem reſurgere.* Thus we ſee, that theſe pretended philoſophic improvements in old times ended in a diſbelief of the reſurrection, and conſequently in the extirpation of the chief tenets and original features of Chriſtianity. Will the Unitarians be able to ſtop the progreſs of their modern philoſophic reformations, before they likewiſe arrive at a denial of the reſurrection and a total alteration of the tenets of Chriſtianity?

which

which tends to contradict his own opinions and arguments. Thus Dr. Prieſtley could readily ſee and quote, from the account of Epiphanius concerning the Ebionites, his evidence, that the Ebionites held *Jeſus* to be merely man,* but he had intirely omitted that other part of his evidence, that the ſame Ebionites held *the Chriſt* to be a ſubordinate Divinity who deſcended from heaven and united himſelf with Jeſus at baptiſm: is this conſiſtent in a ſincere lover of Truth? And if Epiphanius be a good evidence for the former tenet, is he not an equally good evidence for the latter one? No, ſays Dr. P. "Epiphanius moſt ridiculouſly aſcribes the opinions of the Gnoſtics to ſome of the later Ebionites and alſo repreſents them as worſhipping water as a God.†" Now what defect did Dr. P. mean here to impute to Epiphanius, was it a religious prejudice and miſrepreſentation of thoſe Ebionites, or mere error and ignorance of the Truth? If the former, yet *both* of their *chief* tenets were ſo oppoſite to Orthodoxy and obnoxious to its profeſſors, that no fair enquirer can find reaſon why Epiphanius ſhould be credited for the one more than the other: And though there were any malicious miſrepreſentation concerning either, yet I have proved from Tertullian, that it could not have been made by Epiphanius; for in Tertullian the very ſame *two* tenets are attributed to the Ebi-

* "Epiphanius expreſsly ſays, that Ebion held the ſame opinion with the Nazarenes, *&c.*" *Hiſt. of Corrupt. p.* 7.

† Sermon on free Enquiry, p. 87.

onites

onites nearly two centuries *before* Epiphanius was born, and this by an author who wrote within a century after the riſe of the ſecond claſs of Ebionites *. But if on the other hand the defect meant to be imputed to Epiphanius, be that of mere error and ignorance of the truth; yet the very ſame teſtimony from Tertullian clears Epiphanius of this imputation alſo: ſo that if there was either any miſrepreſentation or any error concerning this ſubject, both of them were of much older date than the age of Epiphanius; and there is not the leaſt ground for

* See Preface to my 4th Vol. p. 13. where the paſſage is quoted: Obſerve there alſo, that Tertullian mentions the name *Hebion*. Now Dr. P. affirms "that by *Ebion* we may underſtand *ſome Ebionite*; for I much doubt the exiſtence of ſuch a perſon as Ebion, the *Ebionites* being mentioned *long* before the name *Ebion* occurs in eccleſiaſtical writers." (*Lett. to Dr. H. part* 2. *p.* 23).

Again he ſays, "The term *Ebionites* occurs in Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen and Euſebius," *ibid.* But the real truth is, that though *Ebionitæ* occurs in Irenæus, yet it is *not* to be found any where in Tertullian; while *Ebion* is found in two or three other places beſide that referred to above: In affirming thus a negative, I ſpeak with the reſerve that if Dr. P. can point it out, let him do it; I could never meet with it. Of the above four eccleſiaſtic writers then, the two laſt are nothing to the purpoſe, ſince *Hebion* is found in Tertullian an older writer than Origen and Euſebius: thus the real queſtion is, whether Irenæus, who employs *Ebionitæ* only, wrote *long* before Tertullian, who employs *Ebion* only. Cave places the publication of Irenæus's work about the year of Chriſt 167 or later; but Dodwell maintains, that it was not writ until between 180 and 190 (*Diſſert in Ire-*

Dr. Prieſtley's imputation, that Epiphanius wrote *moſt ridiculouſly*. On the contrary, the teſtimony of Epiphanius gives additional credibility to that of Tertullian; for the former was born of Jewiſh parents, and lived with them in his youth in Paleſtine, before he became a Chriſtian; he not improbably therefore had ſome knowledge in ſome of the Syriac dialects ſpoken by the Jews and other natives of that country: and as he dwelt not far from the chief reſidence of the Ebionites, which was on the eaſt ſide of the Sea of Galilee, he had perhaps

*Irenæum, in ſynopſi Chronol. apud calcem.*) Now Tertullian was made Preſbyter of Carthage in 192, at which time he began to write if not ſooner. Is then the difference of 5 or 10 or 20 years ſufficient to intitle Dr. P. to ſay, that one wrote *long* before the other? And if it be, yet is the circumſtance of a ſingle author Irenæus mentioning *Ebionitæ*, before *Ebion* occurs in another writer Tertullian nearly cotemporary, a ſufficient foundation to conclude that *Ebion* was unknown in the time of Irenæus? Is this hiſtory, criticiſm and reaſoning, or is it mere romance? Might not any other perſon with more probability conclude, that as *Ebion* is found *often* in Tertullian and *ſoon* after Ebionitæ in Irenæus, the general appellation of *Ebionites* was not improbably in this caſe as in others formed from the name of the founder of that ſect *Ebion?* Thus it is, that real knowledge is obſtructed, and pages taken up with falſe gloſſes; and thus Dr. P. conſumes his own and other people's *time* in reaſoning upon facts, which in part have not the leaſt truth in them, and even ſo far as they are true, they enable one to conclude juſt nothing at all: this is the conſequence of preſſing every thing into one's ſervice, which happens to come croſs one's imagination. Theſe errors are retained in *Hiſt. of Opin.* V. 3. 176.

oppor-

opportunities of enquiring into the truth concerning their tenets; which Tertullian, who lived in Italy and Africa, could not. Accordingly, that Epiphanius did make perſonal enquiries concerning their tenets is proved by his own words, where he points out ſome of their tenets in *his own time*, which were different from thoſe held by them *more antiently** : Another paſſage ſeems to imply, that he had frequent opportunities of intercourſe with them†. And what information both Epiphanius and Tertullian derived from others, yet this was however probably borrowed from good authority, namely, from that of Juſtin Martyr; who informs us, that he had himſelf written an hiſtoric treatiſe concerning the firſt chriſtian hereſies: it is a great loſs, that this tract has periſhed; as it was writ while the Ebionites were in their moſt flouriſhing condition, and within 50 years after the riſe of the ſecond claſs of them in the reign of Trajan about the year 98. So that we have as good and as early information extant concerning the tenets of the Ebionites as any fair enquirer can wiſh: fortunately alſo Epiphanius has been more minute and explicit in his account of this hereſy than almoſt any other; and

* Τα νυν δε απηγορευται παντα πασι παρ' αυτοις παρθενια και εγκρατεια—ποτε γαρ παρθενιαν εσεμνυοντο, &c. *Hodie* vero virginitas & caſtitas apud illos omnino prohibetur—*Olim* enim de virginitate gloriari ſolebant. *Hær.* 30.

† " Si ab Lotione ac merſione rediens aliquis eorum in alium hominem fortè fortuna incurrat, denùo ad abluendum ſeſe, ſæpe etiam cum veſtimentis, regreditur. *Ibid.*

as

as we actually find, that he borrows largely from Irenæus in regard to the tenets of the Gnoſtics, we have the more reaſon to preſume, that he borrowed as copiouſly from Juſtin concerning the Ebionites; who was in like manner a native of and occaſional reſident in Paleſtine, though of Greek parents and evidently of a candid moderation as well as inquiſitive diſpoſition. Another circumſtance which proves the unreaſonable nature of Dr. Prieſtley's exception againſt Epiphanius as a competent witneſs in this cauſe, is, that the writers in favor of Humaniſm at the begining of this century ſpeak with particular approbation of Epiphanius as a moſt proper authority concerning the tenets of the Ebionites; and the very reaſon they gave, is, "becauſe he was born in Paleſtine and lived near it *".

Such are the common contradictions, which are conſequent upon a Spirit of Diſputation; for when the Humaniſts in the time of Stillingfleet wanted to confirm ſome point concerning the Ebionites by the evidence of Epiphanius, they could then find reaſons to extol him as a competent authority: but now that Dr. P. finds Epiphanius to ſay too much concerning their belief in the *Divinity* of the Chriſt, it is alleged "that it is only Epiphanius, who moſt ridiculouſly ſays this." Quo teneam vultus mutantem Protea nodo?

But if there were any reaſonable objection to the teſtimony of Epiphanius, yet I have ſhewn,

* In an Anſwer to Dr. Bull, p. 40, as quoted by Stillingfleet in *Vindication of Trinity, p.* 28.

that

that Dr. P. departs from Truth again, in ſaying that it is *only* Epiphanius, who has given this account; for Tertullian had ſaid the ſame almoſt 200 years before Epiphanius *. Now what objection has Dr. P. been able to make to this evidence from Tertullian? Juſt nothing at all: He only obſerves, "that my conſtruction of the paſſage in Tertullian is no leſs wide of my purpoſe: but he will not enlarge upon this topic, until he ſhall ſee how I will acquit myſelf with reſpect to what I have engaged to do" †. That is to ſay, not being able to find any ſolid objection at preſent, he has taken farther time to conſider of it: it ought certainly to be ſomething very weighty when it does come. How my conſtruction of this paſſage is wide of my purpoſe, or what other conſtruction it is capable of, I cannot conceive. Tertullian here informs us, "that Hebion himſelf (not merely the ſecond claſs of Ebionites) ſuppoſed that an angel was *in* the human Jeſus, which union rendered him of a *ſuperior* nature to the prophets, and that this angel ſpoke *in* Jeſus, and directed his conduct," which ſuperintendance of an in-dwelling divinity the heretics repeatedly expreſs by the words πολιτευεσθαι εν τινι. Now what is this account but the very ſame as in Epiphanius, who repeatedly informs us, that the Gnoſtics and Ebionites conſidered the divine Chriſt as an angel, archangel or ſuperangelic divine Being, created by the Father before the creation, who uni-

* See the paſſage in my Preface to Vol. 4. p. 13.
† Lett. to Dr. Horſeley, part 3. p. 62.

ted

ted himſelf to and dwelt in Jeſus? From either author it is plain, that they did not look upon Jeſus himſelf as *the Chriſt*, or chief Agent, but only as the receptacle of a ſuperior Agent; and whether this angel be conſidered as partaking in any degree of a divine nature or not, yet this makes no difference of any moment; it was ſtill not Jeſus, *a mere man*, who was according to them *the Chriſt*, but ſome ſuperior being of a divine nature or of an intermediate nature between Divinity and Humanity: this was alſo the chief principle of the Arians, only with ſome variations in *other* reſpects; how then can Dr. P. aſſert, that the chief principle of Arianiſm was not antient among the Chriſtian Sectaries? Arianiſm in fact was but a varied copy of Gnoſticiſm and Ebionitiſm; it borrowed their chief principle of *a created Chriſt*, and only accommodated it a little more to the mode of orthodoxy, by ſuppoſing their created Chriſt of an intermediate nature to have been united to Humanity by a miraculous conception in Mary, inſtead of a miraculous union to the Humanity of Jeſus at Baptiſm. Paulus of Samoſata varied this doctrine a little more ſtill and only a little, by ſuppoſing, that the divine Chriſt, inſtead of being created before the creation, was firſt created by God, out of his unmanifeſted *Logos*, at the miraculous conception of Mary. So that Paulus was in fact as much a believer in the divinity of Chriſt as the Ebionites and Arians. In order to illuſtrate ſtill farther the above mentioned Ebionitiſh tenet Tertullian adds, that it was of a ſimilar nature to the caſe of the Prophet Zechariah, in whom an angel

was by *ſome* perſons ſuppoſed to have reſided. Now whether this ſuppoſition was true or falſe is foreign to the queſtion; either way it would equally ſerve as an illuſtration of the opinion of the Ebionites. But in reality the ſuppoſition was not true, neither was there the leaſt good foundation for it. There is no evidence exſtant, that the Jews themſelves held any ſuch opinion concerning Zechariah; but it appears by Jerom's and Theodoret's notes on this Prophet, that *ſome* of the antient Chriſtians ſuppoſed it, and that it took its riſe only from a miſtranſlation of a ſentence or two of Zechariah by the Septuagint verſion; where in the ſecond and following chapters Zechariah ſays, that an Angel ſpoke *in me* [εν εμοι] inſtead of προς με, *to me*; as the Hebrew is rendered in ſeveral ſimilar ſentences before and after, and ought to have been rendered in all. The Hebrew prepoſition indeed, which is rendered by *in* (εν) is a different one from that rendered by *to* (προς) but they have both the very ſame ſignification, and there is not the leaſt more reaſon to render one by *in* than the other. Accordingly the ſenſe of *in* is now ſo univerſally exploded, that neither Tremellius, Druſius, Leclerc, Lowth or Biſhop Newcome thought it worth while to take the leaſt notice, that any ſuch ſenſe as *in* had been given to ſome of thoſe paſſages of Zechariah by the Septuagint. But if this example brought by Tertullian to illuſtrate the doctrine of the Ebionites concerning the deſcent of a ſuper-human being into Jeſus had been borrowed from prophane hiſtory, or even from a mere invented Tale, it would juſt as well have ſerved his

his purpoſe of illuſtration, as from this erroneous ſuppoſition of *ſome* of the antient Chriſtians; and the tenet in queſtion of the Ebionites will not be the leſs their belief, becauſe the example which Tertullian employs to illuſtrate the nature of it, is founded on a miſtake: neither could Tertullian have found ſuch another example in all the bible; for although the ſcripture and the Jews allow, that angels ſpoke *to* the Prophets, yet there is no inſtance of any angel being ſaid to ſpeak *in* a Prophet; for which reaſon Tertullian takes notice, that the caſe of Jeſus rendered him *ſuperior* to that of the Prophets, *Prophetis aliquo glorioſiorem* *. But as it was cuſtomary for the popular Jewiſh Theology to ſuppoſe the *lower* order of evil ſpirits or ψυχαι to be united to and reſident in human creatures, there was nothing in the way but want of Cuſtom to render the belief of a ſimilar union juſt as frequent with reſpect to the *ſuperior* order of Angels &c; it would however be naturally conſidered as a more extraordinary

* "Hæc magna eſt gloria Angelis, ut incorporentur & humanis oculis percipiantur, ſed illis duntaxat, qui ſunt puri animabus inter filios prophetarum: & quicunque conſpiciant Angelos, cumque illis colloquuntur, non ſunt abſolutè Prophetæ, verum hæc viſio vocatur, *Revelatio oculorum*, ut in *Num.* 22. 3. *Et aperuit Deus oculos Bileam.*" Excerp: ex Commentar in Penteteuch R. Aharaonis Ben Joſeph Caraitæ. Amſterd. 1705. I refer to a Jew of the Sect of the Caraites becauſe he cannot be ſuppoſed to be infected with the Cabbaliſtic notions of the more modern Rabbinical Jews; but rather to tell us the true opinions of the original Jews.

event and intended for ſome more important purpoſe: therefore the ready and univerſal adoption of this tenet by thoſe Chriſtian Sectaries, the firſt Jewiſh Gnoſtics and Ebionites, contributes again to manifeſt the general currency of that polytheiſtic Theology, which Philo honeſtly attributes to the Jews of his own age.

Since then the teſtimony of Epiphanius is thus confirmed by Tertullian, theſe two evidences to the ſame tenet of the Ebionites muſt in the Eye of impartial readers be reaſonably conſidered as *ſufficiently* convincing in regard to the truth of the fact, and much *ſtronger* than any teſtimonies which Dr. P. has or can produce to the contrary: for it was the profeſſed object of Epiphanius to deſcribe at length the chief tenets of their chriſtian belief; whereas all the evidence produced by Dr. P. that the Ebionites believed *the Chriſt* to be merely man, is only by ſome brief and ſummary expreſſions found in ſeveral of the Fathers, when they were reaſoning upon ſome other ſubject; wherein they had no intention of explaining *the whole* of the Ebionitiſh creed, but introduced incidently only ſo much of it as made for their own reaſoning in thoſe particular paſſages. Yet even theſe aſſert nothing, except what was true, that the Ebionites believed *Jeſus* to be mere man; and they do not contradict the account of Epiphanius; unleſs it be aſſerted, that the Fathers did not and would not ever uſe the appellations of *Chriſt* and *Jeſus Chriſt* in an ambiguous manner agreeably to their own orthodox prepoſſeſſions, rather than according to the Ebionitiſh mode of making a diſtinction and difference between

*Jeſus*

*Jeſus* and *Chriſt*. Upon this ſupported accuracy in the expreſſions of the Fathers the whole of Dr. Prieſtly's evidence depends; an accuracy not to be expected from much more learned and cautious writers, as the different ſenſes in which modern metaphyſicians uſe *divinity*, and *Unitarian* ſufficiently confirm. It might as well be pretended, that ſuch an eminent writer as Cicero would never fall into the inaccuracy of calling Scipio by the name of Africanus, when he is ſpeaking of actions done by Scipio many years before he obtained the name of Africanus; and yet he frequently does. Such a pretended accuracy attributed to the Fathers is doubtleſs too weak a foundation for any one to draw from it [redacted] concluſion ſo directly contradicted by the explicite account of Epiphanius, and alſo by the antient account of ſuch a ſevere and credible writer as Tertullian. This is in fact only to build houſes upon the weak ſtalks of ſtraw.

But Dr. Prieſtley adds "we are promiſed *abundant* evidence of this ſingular poſition—and I take it for granted, that we ſhall find this mighty difference of opinion diſtinctly marked by *many* of the antient writers" *. Now if by *abundant* he meant *numerous*; here he departs from Truth again; for I have never aſſerted, that there were *numerous* teſtimonies of this; but I may have ſuggeſted, that they were *ſtrong* and *ſufficient* ones, as the above teſtimonies really are: For if we conſider how few of the writings of the

* *Remarks* in Appendix to Letters to Dr. Horſley, part 3. *p.* 63.

firſt Chriſtians as well as of prophane Authors have been preſerved, we ought in any particular caſe to think it *ſufficient* to have a fact atteſted by one or two credible and antient authorities. Concerning the antiquity and credibility of Tertullian there can be no doubt; and with reſpect to Epiphanius he is the oldeſt Hiſtorian of chriſtian Hereſies, of whom we have any knowledge, except Juſtin; unleſs Irenæus and Clemens be conſidered as *general* Hiſtorians, which they can not properly be, ſince their views were directed chiefly againſt the particular Hereſy of the Gnoſtics which flouriſhed moſt in their Days: and indeed it was the obſcurity of the Ebionites at that time hid in an unfrequented corner of Paleſtine, bordering on the great deſart, which probably was the reaſon that ſo little has been ſaid about them by Irenæus, Clemens and others; and not becauſe theſe authors had little objection to their doctrine, or did not conſider them as Heretics, as Dr. P. has contended. All the other writers exſtant concerning Hereſies (except Theodoret) Philaſtrius, Prædeſtinatus, Auguſtin and Damaſcenus, were mere epitomiſers of Epiphanius; and while much of his account is omitted by them it is very ſeldom indeed, that any thing is to be found added by them, but, the whole merely copied from Epiphanius, and often indeed verbally tranſlated, as I ſhall have ſome occaſion to ſhew; ſo that *numerous* teſtimonies are not to be expected concerning either this or almoſt any other tenet of the firſt Heretics. It muſt moreover be reaſonably deemed *ſufficient*, if the evidence for chriſtian *tenets* equal or exceed

ceed that which has been admitted as *ſufficient* for prophane *events*. For inſtance, the whole ſeries of Jewiſh reigns depends, for aſcertaining the date of each reign, upon the *ſingle* teſtimony concerning the date of the conqueſt of Babylon by Cyrus in the MSS. of the æra of Nabonaſſar; not any one prophane Hiſtorian now extant having preſerved the date of that event, and very few ſo much as mentioned ſuch an important action; and it is much more likely, that writers ſhould deſcribe *actions* than *opinions*. The preſent MSS. of that æra have been only through mere accident preſerved, by its having been uſed by antient Aſtronomers, who ſtudied Ptolomey's Aſtronomy, ſome dates by this æra being employed there; or rather I ſhould ſay by means of Theon's commentary upon it or in his other aſtronomic tracts; theſe MSS. having been found, I believe, all accidentally annexed to Theon's works. Thus Aſtronomers have through accident upon accident preſerved a *ſingle* teſtimony to the date of one of the moſt important events in hiſtory, while all profeſſed antient Hiſtorians have omitted it. Again, the whole ſucceſſion of kings of Babylon from Nabopolaſſar down to their extinction by Cyrus has no other evidence to prove them a different race of kings from the kings at Niniveh, except a *ſingle* teſtimony, that Nabopolaſſar had rebelled and freed Babylonia from ſubjection to the kings at Niniveh; which is found in a paſſage of Syncellus, who lived 800 years after Chriſt, and who quoted it out of Alexander Polyhiſtor, who lived in the time of Julius Cæſar; and he copied it from ſome more an-

tient Hiſtorian, but we know not whom *. How many more examples of a ſimilar kind may be produced? And ſhall ſuch *ſingle* teſtimonies and round-about accidental informations concerning important prophane events be thought ſo *ſufficient* and ſatisfactory as to find a place in all modern compilations of prophane Hiſtory, and become the foundation of their connexion with the accuracy and authenticity of the old teſtament? and yet ſhall the harmonious relations of Tertullian and Epiphanius be rejected, although oppoſed by no evidence of the leaſt weight whatever, but only by a mere ambiguity and double ſenſe concerning the word *Chriſt?* Epiphanius moreover, has repeated the ſame account in ſuch a variety of Expreſſions, that there can be no doubt about his meaning; and Tertullian has fortunately had occaſion to confirm the *moſt material* part of his evidence. As to the *general* character of Epiphanius, I find not the leaſt more reaſon to object to his accounts than to thoſe of any other of the Fathers, on whom Dr. Prieſtley ſo much relies: they were all men of more veracity than accuracy and erudition, and had more of the virtues of the heart than of the head; which is a circumſtance much in their favor, as the imaginations of the head are very apt to miſlead men. Neither is any perſon more ready than Dr. P. himſelf to quote the authority of Epiphanius, when it makes in his favor: the information, which he has preſerved to us concerning the ſtate of chriſtian antiquity is indeed

* See the paſſage quoted in my 2d Vol. p. 359.

often

often invaluable; he is, however, like all the other hiſtorians of heretics, generally too brief and imperfect in his relations, on account of his unfortunately exerting himſelf with more zeal to refute the chief erroneous tenets of the Heretics, than to inform us explicitly and minutely what tenets they held, and the ſeveral variations in them. But if I found a hundredth part of the miſtakes, inaccuracies, and romances in the Hiſtory of Epiphanius, as in Dr. Prieſtley's own hiſtories, I ſhould readily give him up as an incompetent witneſs *.

* As another example of this, Dr. Prieſtley in his chronologic liſt of Authors, prefixed to his letter to Dr. Horſeley, part 2. p. 27. places Artemon, as living *before* Theodotus, the former in 187, the latter in 192; but the real fact is, that Artemon lived *later* than Theodotus, and not until about 210 or 220, as all writers uniformly agree, except Nicephorus the monk, who wrote only a little before the capture of Conſtantinople by the Turks; to whom little credit is due: for the imperial library was then extant, yet ſo little curious was he, that nothing is to be found in him concerning the firſt Chriſtian ages, except what is copied from Euſebius, and other writers ſtill extant. Dr. P. has continued the ſame error in his Chronologic Liſt ſubjoined to his *Hiſtory of early Opinions*. Was this done in order to give Artemon a little lift into the ſecond century, and favour the antiquity of Humaniſm? Or was it a miſtake ariſing from the order obſerved in Lardner's *Hiſt. of Heretics*, who treats of Artemon before Theodotus? Nevertheleſs, he allows that Tillemont did otherwiſe, and placed Artemon not before the year 200, and Lardner adds, "That it might be ſo, but he himſelf places Artemon firſt, and has choſen this order with-

*Farther*

## *Farther Proofs of the Belief of the Ebionites in the Deſcent of the divine Chriſt, from Theodoret;—and of their Reſemblance to the Cerinthians from other Authors.*

BUT if even the addition of Tertullian's teſtimony to that of Epiphanius ſhould not be deemed *ſufficient*, yet Theodoret will come in to our aſſiſtance as a third evidence; and ſurely from the mouths of two or three ſuch witneſſes this truth muſt be *abundantly* eſtabliſhed in eccleſiaſtic hiſtory, if we have to depend ſo often upon the credit of a ſingle evidence with reſpect to prophane events. Now Epiphanius informs us, that the *ſecond* claſs of Ebionites aroſe about the time of Elcſai, who boaſted, that he had tutored four different ſects in his own Chriſtian tenets, namely the two Jewiſh ſects of Oſſenes and Nazarites, together with

out deſigning to determine which had the precedence in order of time, and only becauſe Theodoret treats of Artemon before Theodotus" (p. 363.) This then is an inſufficient reaſon; for Theodoret never pretends to treat of the Heretics in the ſame order, in which they flouriſhed; poſſibly Nicephorus was miſled by the ſame reaſon. The extract from a tract againſt Artemon in Euſebius clearly proves him to have lived *after* Theodotus (5. 25.), as Lardner thus allows, " It muſt be owned, that that author ſays, Theodotus was the *author* of that opinion, and poſſibly the reaſon of his entitling his work againſt Artemon was, that he was then *living*, and had promoted the doctrine of his *predeceſſors*."

the

the two Chriſtian ſects of Ebionites and later Nazarenes, as Epiphanius calls them *. Elcſai lived, according to Epiphanius, in the reign of Trajan, therefore between the years of Chriſt 98 and 117 †: this is confirmed by the paſchal chronicon, which ſays, "That the hereſy of the Ebionites was conſpicuous in the conſulſhip of Candidus and Quadratus." This was

* "Elcſai cum Ebionæis conjunctus et cum poſterioribus Nazarenis, eumque Sectæ quatuor auctorem ſibi vendicant, quæ illius erroribus afficiuntur, viz. Ebionæi et poſteriores Nazareni (τοις μετεπειτα γεγονοσι Ναζωραιοις) et Oſſeni qui ante eum et cum eo prodierunt et Naziritæ ſupra memorati." *Hær.* 19. *Sect.* 5. It is wonderful what confuſion it cauſed by critics, who do not attend to the writer's words, whom they criticiſe and condemn. Thus Leclerc in his eccleſiaſtical hiſtory objects, that he never heard of any ſuch perſons as the *later Nazarenes:* he might have obſerved, that Epiphanius calls all the firſt Chriſtians Nazarenes, and here points out *when* the *heterodox ſect* of Nazarenes aroſe, and *by whom* they were rendered ſo. In the ſame manner Dr. P. alſo departs from hiſtoric truth, when he ſuggeſts, "as being highly *probable*, that the Nazarenes of the ſecond century were the *ſame people* with thoſe of the firſt, or the primitive Jewiſh Chriſtians." But we have here extant *poſitive* information, that they were not; for though they might be deſcendants by nature, yet they had corrupted their religious tenets and become heretical under the tutorage of Elcſai. See *Lett. to Dr. H. part.* 1. *p.* 14. N. B. at p. 11. in my Preface, I have ſaid by miſtake that *Mangey* thought the Nazarenes to be orthodox; I now find that he did not.

† Ηλξαι εν χρονοις Τραϊανε βασιλεως. *Hær.* 19. *ſect.* 1.

in

in the year 105*. Theodoret miſunderſtands Euſebius, as placing the Ebionites and Nazarenes in the preceeding reign of Domitian, that is, between 81 and 97 †. Hence it appears, that even the *ſecond* claſs of Ebionites aroſe ſo early, that it is not eaſy to diſtinguiſh in point of priority between the two with any certainty: Epiphanius however may ſeem to place Ebion himſelf and the *firſt* claſs of Ebionites ſomething ſooner, namely between the capture of Jeruſalem by Titus in the year 70, and the time of Elcſai about 98; but they could flouriſh only a very ſhort time, if any, before they were intermixed and confounded with the *ſecond* claſs. The author alſo of the tract *De Predeſtinatione* ſays, "Elceſaitas Papias preſbyter Achaiæ obtonuit;" another proof of the antiquity of Elcſai and the ſecond claſs of Ebionites; for Papias flouriſhed about the year 110, as Dr. P. ſays ‡. Now Epiphanius in his brief *ſummary* concerning the

* Υπατων Κανδιδου και Κουδρατε ἡ των Εβιωνεων αἱρεσις εγνωριζετο. p. 252.

† "Conflatas eſſe has hæreſes, imperante Domitiano, dixit Euſebius." *Hær. Fabul. lib.* 1. But Euſebius does not ſay this.

‡ I have pointed out theſe dates more particularly, becauſe the *editor* of Lardner's poſthumous *Hiſt. of Heretics* has not in his *addition* clearly ſtated when Elcſai lived. It may be obſerved moreover, as truly wonderful, that Lardner, if inclined to Unitarianiſm, ſhould have left no accounts behind him, concerning either the Ebionites, Nazarenes, or Elſeſaites: one ſhould have thought, that theſe pretended founders of his own ſyſtem would have been the firſt to claim his attention. I cannot then but ſuſpect, that they

Ebionites,

Elceſaites, prefixed to his lib. 2. tom. 1. ſays expreſsly, "That the Elceſaites held nearly the ſame opinions in *all things* with the Ebionites." * Is it poſſible, that Epiphanius, or any writers could have expreſſed themſelves thus, in caſe there had been ſo great a difference between the Elceſaites and a great part of the Ebionites, as that the former conſidered Chriſt to be divine, while the latter eſteemed him as a mere man? Now, that the Elceſaites believed in the deſcent of a *divine Chriſt*, and his union with the humanity of Jeſus is proved by all writers, but particularly by Theodoret, who ſays, "They believe, that there is one unbegotten being, and him they call the Maker of all things; yet they do not ſay, that *Chriſt* was *one*, but that there was one *above* and another *below*, and that he had formerly dwelt in many perſons, but that at laſt he *deſcended*. *Jeſus* alſo, as Elcſai ſays ſometimes, was *ex Deo*, but at other times he calls him a ſpirit, and ſome-

have been ſuppreſſed, becauſe they proved too plainly the belief of the Ebionites in the divinity of Chriſt. For Lardner was of too inquiſitive and too rational a turn of mind, to have thus neglected altogether the moſt important hereſies of the firſt centuries, while he treated minutely of ſeveral inconſiderable ones; and he was apparently too honeſt to have miſled his readers with reſpect to the real tenets of the Ebionites and Nazarenes. *Hinc ille Hiatus.* This is the more ſtrange, becauſe he does give ſome account of thoſe ſects in his other works, but nothing any way favourable to their being the founders of Humaniſm.

* Ελκεσαιοι παραπλησιως των Εβιωναιων τα παντα εχοντες.

times

times that a virgin was his mother: in other writings however not even this: again, he says, that he passes into other bodies, and at every time he appeared differently."* Observe that Theodoret's word here is *Jesus*, not *Christ* as before, if Lardner and the Latin translator have not deceived me; I do not however depend much upon the accuracy of the Fathers in making a proper distinction between *Jesus* and *Christ*; but the subsequent portion of the sentence seems to demand, that *Jesus* only was *meant* there; so that some of the Elcesaites even allowed, that *Jesus* was divine at his birth, as well as produced by a miraculous conception. Epiphanius relates nearly to the same purport, but he does not notice that particular of Elcsai's believing in two Christs, one *above* and another *below*; so that Theodoret must have copied this article from some other author than Epiphanius, not improbably from Justin Martyr's History of the most antient Heresies: this circumstance therefore gives the greater authority to the above account, by its proving that Theodoret was not an epitomiser of Epiphanius as Augustin was; and that if his account agrees in most points with Epiphanius, it was because both of them had probably copied accurately from the same work of Justin, a work of high antiquity and authenticity †. The above

* *Hæret. Fab. de Elcesaitis.* I am prevented from quoting the Greek by not having such an edition at hand; but see this passage quoted in Lardner's *History of Heretics*, at p. 432.

† Here it may be observed, that this doctrine of two Christs, one above and another below, was after-

above doctrine then of the Elceſaites is evidently the very ſame, which Epiphanius aſcribes to the *ſecond* claſs of Ebionites: it will not indeed hence follow, that it was alſo held by Ebion and the *firſt* claſs of them (in caſe thoſe called the firſt claſs were really older than the ſecond claſs, which is ſomewhat doubtful) but then Theodoret under his article of the Ebionites, ſupplies this deficient link, and declares, that he knew of no difference between the two claſſes, except *ſolely* in the circumſtance of the miraculous conception. His words are, "Ebion Chriſtum Jeſum dicebat ex Joſepho et Maria eſſe natum, qui homo quidem erat, ſed virtute vitæque innocentiâ aliis antecellebat--Erat autem præter eam alia ſecta, quæ idem cognomen habebat; hi enim Ebionitæ vocantur, qui *in aliis omnibus* cum prioribus conveniunt, niſi quod ſervatorem dicunt natum eſſe de virgine." Here again we may aſk, is it poſſible, that Theodoret alſo could have expreſſed himſelf in this manner, if there had been ſo wide a difference between the two claſſes of Ebionites, as Dr. P. pretends? On the contrary, it clearly appears by the words *in aliis omnibus*, that the belief of the deſcent of the divine Chriſt, in ſome mode

wards the tenet of Valentinus about the year 120; hence then ſome doubt ariſes, whether even this tenet was the invention of Valentinus and the Gnoſtics, and not rather derived from an earlier ſource, that is, from the popular Jewiſh theology, and the ſuperſtition of the firſt ſectaries of the Jewiſh perſuaſion; ſome remains of this opinion ſtill exiſt among the later Jewiſh rabbins, who maintain that there are to be two Meſſiahs.

or

or other muſt have been common to both claſſes, otherwiſe there would remain *nothing*, in which they could reſemble each other, or reſemble the Elceſaites with reſpect to their belief in Chriſt; accordingly Origen and Euſebius agree with Theodoret, in making no other difference between the two claſſes of Ebionites than merely in the miraculous conception of Jeſus. Now Dr. P. himſelf allows, that there is the more reaſon to depend upon Theodoret's teſtimony in this ſubject, "becauſe he lived in Syria, where he had the beſt opportunity of being acquainted with the ſtate of the Jewiſh churches believing in Chriſt" *: But I may add as another and a better reaſon, that he expreſsly declares, that he drew his information on the ſubject of the firſt hereſies from Juſtin's tract on the antient Heretics, as well as from many others (among whom Epiphanius is not ſo much as mentioned), and all theſe except one or two were much older than the time of Epiphanius †. If then notwithſtanding this, Theodoret

* Letter to Dr. Horſeley, part 1. p. 23.

† "Hæreſium antiquarum fabulas ex antiquis eccleſiæ doctoribus collegi, Juſtino Martyre et Irenæo, Clemente et Origine et Euſebio, tam Paleſtino quam Phænice et Adamantio, Rhodone et Tito et Diodoro et Georgio et aliis, qui linguas ſuas adverſus falſum armarunt." *Epiſt. præfat. ad Sporacium.* It may be obſerved, that Theodoret mentions Adamantius here as an author different from Origen, who was ſo ſurnamed; but no other writer of this name is known of. I apprehend then, that he referred by this name to Origin's reputed Dialogues againſt the Marcio-

doret agrees with Epiphanius, what can be a ſtronger proof, that both of theſe authors copied accurately from Juſtin and others, and that Epiphanius cannot by any *ridiculous miſtake* of his own have *confounded* the tenets of Ebion with thoſe of Cerinthus or Elceſai, as Dr. P. pretends. Nay, ſtill farther, that it was more *particularly* his accounts of the Ebionites and Nazarenes, which Theodoret copied from Juſtin he himſelf alſo acknowledges in another place; for having treated of thoſe two hereſies in ſucceſſion, he adds immediately after "adverſus *eos* ſcripſit Juſtinus et Irenæus et Origenes."

The doctrine then attributed above by Theodoret to *both* claſſes of Ebionites ſufficiently proves alſo how nearly they reſembled the Cerinthian Gnoſtics, who without diſpute believed in the deſcent of the divine Chriſt; and this Theodoret confirms ſtill farther by his conduct in the diviſion of his hiſtory of hereſies. For after having divided them into the two *general* claſſes, of thoſe who conſidered Chriſt as a *mere phantaſm*, and thoſe who believed Jeſus to be *mere man*, he includes Cerinthus, and him alone of all the Gnoſtics in the latter claſs among the Ebionites and Elceſaites, whom (as I have ſhewn above) he conſidered as believing in the deſcent of the divine Chriſt into the *merely human* Jeſus: and he even makes Ebion the tutor of Cerinthus; for he treats of Ebion

nites; in which the firſt and chief ſpeaker in favour of the orthodox is *Adamantius*; hence they were ſometimes called by others *Dialogi Adamantii*.

firſt, and calls him *hujus catervæ princeps*. All *general* diviſions muſt neceſſarily be in ſome reſpects inaccurate; and too much ſtreſs muſt not be placed upon any concluſions drawn from thence alone: but after the information of Tertullian, Epiphanius, and of Theodoret himſelf, that *all* the Ebionites believed in the deſcent of a *divine Chriſt*, we may with ſome ſafety conclude, that the ſimilar belief of Cerinthus in the ſame doctrine was *one* cauſe of this arrangement, as well as their ſimilar belief in *Jeſus* as a *mere man*; and at leaſt it will appear hence how *common* it was with the firſt Chriſtians to claſs Ebion and Cerinthus together, whatever the reaſon might be. If the only reaſon had been becauſe Cerinthus believed Jeſus to be mere man from Joſeph, why do we never meet with Carpocrates arranged in the ſame claſs with Ebion? For the former alſo believed Jeſus to be mere man *: but apparently he did not believe in the deſcent of the divine Chriſt at baptiſm; hence then probably the reaſon, why he is never found claſſed along with Ebion. We find the ſame practice of arranging Ebion along with Cerinthus in uſe among all other Chriſtian writers. Thus the antient author of the additional ſection to Tertullian *De preſcriptione Hereticorum* (in caſe it be not Tertullian's own, of which I find no ſufficient proof, nothing being mentioned in it of later date than the time of Tertullian, unleſs it be the name of

* "Statuit Carpocrates Jeſum genitum eſſe ex Joſepho." *Epiph. Hær.* 27.

Victorinus,

Victorinus) * ſays, " Hujus [Cerinthi] ſucceſſor Hebion fuit, Cerintho non in omni parte conſentiens, quod a Deo dicat mundum, non ab Angelis, factum." Here we find, that this writer conſiders Ebion not as the tutor, but as the ſucceſſor and follower of Cerinthus; between the principles of which two he ſuggeſts *no other* difference, than in regard to the Gnoſtic principle, whether the ſupreme God was the maker of the world or not: this intimates no difference between them with reſpect to their belief concerning *Jeſus* and *the Chriſt*; but only concerning a different tenet, which formed the

* Dr. P. after Beauſobre conceives *Victorinus* to mean *Victor*, Biſhop of Rome (Hiſt. of early Opin. v. 3. 304.) this would indeed be conſiſtent with the age of Tertullian himſelf and the difference of orthography is no ſufficient objection; but then it is a mere ſuppoſition. It ſeems to me as probable that the perſon meant was Victorinus Afer, a celebrated rhetorician at Rome, about the year 360, who tranſlated many of Plato's works and turned Chriſtian in his old age, when he wrote in favor of the Trinity againſt Arius and the Manichees, which tracts Jerom calls, *Libros valde obſcuros, qui niſi ab eruditis non intelliguntur*: He wrote alſo *De Generatione Verbi*, and *De Homouſio*. Jerom adds, that " Victorinus occupatus eruditione ſecularium literarum Scripturas omnino ignoravit, et nemo poſſit quamvis eloquens de eo bene diſputare quod neſciat." His being ſo converſant with Platoniſm might probably lead him to explications, which bordered on Sabellianiſm. Cave ſays, " Victorinus non videtur ubique fidei dogmata ſatis accurate percepiſſe, ſaltem non ſatis feliciter expreſſiſſe." In this caſe Tertullian could not be the author of that ſection.

chief mark, whether any ſectary was to be ranked among the Gnoſtics or not. Jerom likewiſe often claſſes Ebion with Cerinthus, as for inſtance, " Cerinthum et ejus ſucceſſorem Ebionem †. Philaſtrius goes ſtill farther, and directly calls Ebion a *diſciple* of Cerinthus, with whom alſo he agreed *in many errors*, not in that *ſingle* one of believing Jeſus to be mere man, the ſon of Joſeph, as Dr. P. would perſuade us to ſuppoſe ‡. Pacianus, a cotemporary of Epiphanius claſſes Ebion indifferently along with the two Gnoſtics Appelles and Marcion, the latter a *Phantomiſt*, the former *not*, but both believers in the deſcent of the divine Chriſt at baptiſm §. Jerom does indeed agree with Epiphanius, that St. John wrote the introduction to his Goſpel in oppoſition to the Ebionites, whoſe doctrine was then *beginning to riſe* (conſurgens—pullulans) about the year 98 or *ſooner*; but Pacianus, we ſee, places Ebion in *later times* than the firſt Gnoſtics, and alſo claſſes him with others, who lived *later* than St. John, more agreeably to the date we aſſigned before for the rife of the *ſecond* claſs of *Ebionites* in the reign of Trajan, or *later*. Jerom's date is agreeable to the account of Irenæus, who ſpeaks of St. John's old age, when he wrote his Goſpel,

† Dialog. contra Luciferianos.

‡ " Hebion diſcipulus Cerinthi *in multis* ei ſimiliter errans." *Hær.* 37.

§ " Dinumerare per longum eſt, Simon Magus et Menander et Nicolaus et alii—quid *poſterioribus temporibus* Ebion et Apelles et Marcion et Valentinus et Cerdon?" *Pacianii epiſtol.* 1. *ad Sympronianum. Biblioth. Patr. de la Bigne, tom.* 3. *p.* 418.

as

as being almoſt in his own age or generation ‖; but then he declares, that it was againſt the *Cerinthians* that St. John wrote his Goſpel; and the meeting at a bath in Epheſus, which Epiphanius relates as happening between St. John and Ebion, Irenæus aſcribes to St. John and Cerinthus *. Here we find the very *perſons* as well as *principles* of Ebion and Cerinthus exchanged for each other. Theſe antient teſtimonies prove, that there muſt have been ſome *broader* as well as *older* foundation for claſſing together the tenets of Ebion with thoſe of Cerinthus and ſeveral other of the Gnoſtics, than a mere *miſtake* of Epiphanius *alone* ſo late as the fourth century: and if it was a miſtake at all, it was at leaſt an *univerſal* one among the Fathers, as well as one *more antient* than Epiphanius. But that there was no miſtake at all, is alſo in ſome meaſure confirmed by theſe ſame teſtimonies; they are indeed expreſſed in too *brief* and *general* a way to manifeſt in what points the tenets of Ebion and Cerinthus reſembled each other; yet they at leaſt manifeſt, that it muſt have been in *more* points than that *ſingle* one concerning the generation of Jeſus by Joſeph: but the evidence of Tertullian and Theodoret ſupplies their defect of

‖ Σχεδον επι της ἡμετερας γενεης προς τω τελει της Δομετιανε αρχης. Pene ſub noſtro ſeculo ad finem Domitiani imperii. *Vet. tranſlat. Irenæi, lib.* 5. 449. Domitian died in 97.

* Epiph. Hær. 30. ſect. 24.—"Johannes volens per Evangelii annunciationem auferre eum, qui a Cerintho inſeminatus erat hominibus errorem. *Irenæus,*

brevity, and agrees with Epiphanius in explaining what those *particular* tenets were, namely the descent of a subordinate divine Christ at baptism, as well as the mere humanity of Jesus at his birth; *both* of which are opposed by St. John in his introduction †. So that Dr. Priestley's *unsupported supposition* has to strive against the stream of *antient tradition*, the *universal consent* of the Fathers, and the *express declaration* of three respectable ones, Tertullian, Epiphanius, and Theodoret: thus every light, which we can

† It may be remarked moreover, that the belief of a *divine Christ*, as well as of the mere humanity of *Jesus*, are *both* of them plainly implied as articles of the creed of Hebion as well as of Cerinthus in the following account, which Jerom gives of the doctrine which St. John intended to oppose in his Gospel; for he says, "Johannes cum esset in Asia et jam tunc hæreticorum semina *pullularent* Cherinti, Hebionis et ceterorum, qui *negant* Christum in carne venisse—coactus est de divinitate Salvatoris altius scribere." *Pref. Comm. in Matth.* Now the tenet of Hebion according to Dr. P. consisted in his *asserting* that Christ *was* come in the flesh; whereas Jerom here makes the tenet of Hebion and Cerinthus, which John opposed, to be quite the contrary, viz. in *denying* that *Christ was* come in the flesh; which necessarily implies, that they both allowed Christ *to be come in some other way*, altho' he was *not* conceived and born of Mary according to the flesh, as *Jesus* was. This account can be made consistent with the belief of Ebion in Christianity no other way, than by its *implying*, that *both* those sectaries believed *the Christ* to have come from heaven into Jesus at his baptism, as Cerinthus certainly did, or else that he did not assume a real human body; the former of which was the tenet of some of the Gnostics, the latter of others.

derive

derive from the caſual expreſſions of the antient Chriſtians, together with every ſcrap of hiſtoric information tranſmitted down to us, conſpire in juſtifying the account of Epiphanius ‡. There is indeed no end of indulging doubts and *ſuppoſitions* againſt antient facts, which are not capable of actual demonſtration either way: but the judgment and candour of a writer are diſplayed in fairly collecting together the *whole* evidence ſtill extant, inſtead of partially ſtraining a *ſingle* quotation or two to make them ſpeak in favour of his own ſuppoſition; and then confidently aſſerting to his unlettered readers, that the contrary opinion to his own, is "againſt the teſtimony, he may ſafely ſay, of all other antient writers," although in reality it is confirmed by the *univerſal voice* of them all, as I have proved.

If there be any room to doubt any thing in the account of Epiphanius, it is in regard to his ſeeming to place Ebion, and thoſe called the *firſt* claſs of Ebionites too early, by ſuppoſing

‡ "That the repreſentation of Epiphanius, which is *wholly his own*, is founded on ſome *miſtake*, cannot be doubted; and I think it moſt probable, that he had *confounded* the doctrines of the Ebionites with thoſe of the Cerinthians, who agreed with them in *ſome* things, eſpecially in Jeſus being a *mere man*, born as other men are." *Dr. Prieſtley's Hiſtory of early Opinions, vol.* 3. *ch.* 10. 209.—"A moſt extraordinary and highly improbable allegation of Epiphanius with reſpect to the Ebionites is his charging them with the peculiar doctrines of the Gnoſtics, which is contrary to the teſtimony, I may ſafely ſay, of *all other antient* writers." *Ibid.* p. 206.

them

them *prior* to the death of St. John; in which error Jerom may have merely followed Epiphanius §. We have ſeen ſome evidence of this being an error from Irenæus and Pacianus: Irenæus alſo in another place ſupplies us with another teſtimony, to the ſame purport, and which ſeems ſtrongly to indicate, that thoſe commonly called the *firſt* claſs of Ebionites, were in reality the *laſt*, which aroſe. For after informing us, that Aquila and Theodotion rendered the Hebrew word *haalmah* in the prophecy of Iſaiah by *a young woman* inſtead of a *virgin*, he adds, Quos *ſecuti* Ebionæi ex Joſeph eum generatum dicunt." * Now Aquila did not publiſh his tranſlation of the Scriptures until about the year 120, Theodotion ſtill later; and Irenæus ſeems here to aſſert that the claſs of Ebionites, who believed Jeſus to be the ſon of Joſeph, were *followers* of Aquila, therefore later in their origin than thoſe called the *ſecond* claſs, who were tutored and introduced by Elcſai, as early

§ "Johannes cum eſſet in Aſia, et jam tunc hæreticorum ſemina *pullularent* Cherinti, Hebionis et cæterorum, &c. *Hieron. Præf. Comm. Matth.*—tunc Ebionitarum dogma *conſurgens*" (*De Script. Eccleſ.*) "John finding men employed *about the humanity of Chriſt*, and the Ebionites being in an error, &c." *Epiph. h.* 69. But the Greek is περι την κατω χριστου παρουσιαν, i. e. *about the advent of Chriſt below.* παρουσια, *the coming*, is ſuch a neutral word, as neither implies divinity nor humanity, not even with addition of κατω. Yet, we ſee, Dr. P. ſtrains it to mean humanity. *Letters to Dr. H. part* 2. 16. Hiſt. of opin: Vol. 3. 140.

* Οις κατακολουθησαντες οι Εβιωναιοι εξ Ιωσηφ αυτον γεγενησθαι φασκουσι, *lib.* 3. *c.* 24.

as

as the reign of Trajan, about the year 98. This is moreover in ſome meaſure countenanced by Epiphanius himſelf; for he candidly acknowledges, that he could not pretend to determine, whether the Cerinthians aroſe *before* or *after* the heterodox ſects of Nazarenes and Ebionites †; but the riſe of the heterodox Nazarenes (with whom he makes the Ebionites cotemporary), he himſelf places no ſooner than in the reign of Trajan under Elcſai, as we have ſeen: the 2*d* Claſs might therefore, even according to Epiphanius himſelf, have been *prior* to the exiſtence of thoſe called the *firſt* claſs of Ebionites, more eſpecially if there really never was any ſuch perſon as Ebion, which Dr. P. maintains. Neither is it any contradiction to this, even if what Epiphanius and Jerom have ſaid elſewhere be true (which however Irenæus has proved doubtful) that St. John wrote his Goſpel againſt the Ebionites; for the perſons here in their view might have been thoſe called the *ſecond* claſs, who aroſe, as we have ſeen, in the reign of Trajan about 98, if not ſooner and under Domitian, therefore before St. John's death: ſome, if not all, of whom conceived *Jeſus* to be *mere man*, though not the ſon of Joſeph (for they held the miraculous conception), therefore even theſe ſtood equally in need of being corrected by St. John, as the other claſs

† "Nazareni ſive *priores* illis [Cerinthianis] ſive poſteriores exſtiterint, ſive cotemporanci, in idem fere tempus incurrunt; neque affirmare certo poſſumus utri utris ſucceſſerint—Ebion illorum [Nazarenorum] *æqualis* fuit." *Hær.* 29. *ſect.* 1. and *Hær.* 30. *ſect.* 2.

did, it being his object *de divinitate Salvatoris altius dicere.* Dr. P. indeed ſuppoſes *ſomewhere,* that St. John wrote his Goſpel as early as the capture of Jeruſalem in the year 70; but the Fathers ſuppoſe, that he did not write it until after his 90th year of age, and that he did not die, until the reign of Trajan after 98. This is a circumſtance, which Dr. P. ought not to have *omitted,* when he ſpeaks of the Ebionites as being cotemporary with *the apoſtles*; for whether the fact be true or not, concerning the date aſſigned by the Fathers to St. John's goſpel, this is totally foreign to the queſtion; it is the time *when* the Fathers *ſuppoſe* St. John to have writ his Goſpel, which determines the date of the riſe both of Ebionites and Nazarenes, as ſectaries ‡‡. So that we find no *certain* proof of the exiſtence of *any* Ebionites before the *ſecond* claſs in 98; and though Epiphanius does indeed at times ſeem to afford ſome grounds for *our concluding*, that the Ebionites who believed Jeſus to be the ſon of Joſeph, exiſted *before* the other claſs, who believed the miraculous conception; yet on examination they will be found only *doubtful grounds* for ſuch a concluſion; and Epiphanius no where expreſsly affirms it: but on the contrary, at other times he affords (as Dr. P. himſelf allows) grounds for our concluding,

‡‡ "Permanſit Johannes uſque ad Trajani tempora." *Iren.* 2. 39. Moreover, Irenæus, we have ſeen, places the *old age* of St. John (when as they ſuppoſe he wrote his Goſpel) at the *end* of Domitian's reign, who died in 97. Epiphanius in like manner dates it "In ſenili ætate poſt nonageſimum annum vitæ." *Hær.* 51. 12.

that

that he places the belief of Ebion himſelf concerning the mere humanity of Jeſus in direct oppoſition to the belief of his followers, as if theſe were *all* believers in the divinity of the Chriſt ‖; the neceſſary conſequence of which is, that he does not decide, which of the two claſſes of Ebionites exiſted *before* the other, nor whether the origin of both is not to be attributed to the very ſame time, when Elcſai joined himſelf to Ebion as a Chriſtian inſtructor about the year 98.

But although the *priority of* origin in theſe two claſſes of Ebionites is a point, which Epiphanius has not, becauſe he probably could not determine; as indeed he himſelf informs us it was not in his power to do in regard to the origin of ſeveral of the moſt ancient hereſies §; yet I can find no foundation for Dr. Horſeley's accuſation of him in regard to what he calls—"the confuſed chronology of this inaccurate writer *," and ſtill leſs for Dr. Prieſtley's accuſation of inconſiſtency in the chronology of Epiphanius: on the contrary it is not Epiphanius, who is confuſed or inconſiſtent; but it has been Dr. P. himſelf, who has drawn *concluſions*

‖ "Epiphanius aſcribes theſe doctrines (concerning the divinity of the Chriſt, &c.) not to Ebion himſelf, but to his followers." *Hiſt. of Opin. vol.* 3. p. 208.

§ "Nazaræi, ſive priores Cerinthianis, ſive æquales ſive poſteriores extiterent, in idem ferè tempus incurrunt: neque enim affirmare certò poſſumus [de hæreſibus,] utri utris ſucceſſerint." *Hær.* 29. *ſect.* 1.

* Lett. to Dr. P. part. 1. 47.

from

from the words of Epiphanius, which do not follow from them, and in direct contradiction to this author's meaning; ſo that any apparent confuſion or inconſiſtency exiſts only in Dr. Prieſtley's own reaſoning. Thus, as I ſaid above, becauſe Epiphanius and Jerom agree in mentioning the Ebionites as exiſting *before* St. John wrote his Goſpel, hence Dr. P. *concludes* "There can be no doubt then, but that both Ebionites and Nazarenes were exiſting in the time of *the apoſtles* †." Now this is a *concluſion*, which does no way follow from the words of Epiphanius; for all the twelve *apoſtles*, except St. John, were dead before the year 70, and St. Paul likewiſe; St. John alone continued according to Epiphanius until the year 98, or later, and a little before his death wrote his Goſpel, or the introduction to it: the only concluſion then from this is, that the Ebionites were exiſtent *before the year* 98, and the death of the *ſingle ſurviving apoſtle* St. John. || This is the earlieſt origin, which can be hence aſſigned to them; but at this date thoſe called the *ſecond* claſs of them had *ſprung up*, and poſſibly alſo the *firſt*: now againſt which of the two St. John's introduction was directed we are ignorant; it was equally applicable to them both, as they *chiefly* differed in regard to the miraculous conception, and not the mere humanity of Jeſus. Agreeably to this Jerom alſo allows, that

† Hiſt. of Opin. vol. 3. p. 166.

|| Hence we ſee how inconſiſtent Dr. P. is himſelf, when he remarks, "that Epiphanius in no per-

that the dogma of the Ebionites was *conſurgens* and *pullulans* before the death of St. John §; from both authors then it appears, that though *ſome* of the Ebionites exiſted, in 98, yet they could not become *flouriſhing* (and poſſibly might not be known among Chriſtians by *the names* of Ebionites and Nazarenes) before the time, which Dr. Horſeley has aſſigned, namely in the reign of Adrian, which began in the year 117; accordingly this, and even later is the time, which Prateoli had long ago aſſigned to theſe ſects, "Nazaræi eruperunt Adriani temporibus circa annum 133" *: He probably ſaid this upon the evidence of that paſſage in Irenæus, which I have quoted above; and which ſeems to aſcribe a later origin than the year 120 to the moſt ob-

ſect conſiſtence with his account of the Nazarenes giving alarm to St John, places their origin after the deſtruction of Jeruſalem in the year 70." *Hiſt. of Opin. vol.* 3. 165. What, does not the year 70 *precede* the year 98, at which time, and not before the Nazarenes and Ebionites alarmed St. John? The inconſiſtence then is only in Dr. Prieſtley's own *concluſion*, that the Nazarenes alarmed St. John in the time of *the apoſtles*, i. e. *ſooner* than Epiphanius really ſays, or ever dreamt of. Such are the unhappy conſequences of a ſpirit of diſputation, that it firſt leads one's readers into confuſion, and then entangles the writer himſelf in the midſt of the confuſion of his own creation!

§ Here we may obſerve, that Dr. P. ſtrains *dogma conſurgens* to mean *a flouriſhing Sect* (Lett. to Dr. H. part. 2. 19.) though in reality it only means *beginning to riſe* or commencing, as is explained by Jerom's other word *pullulans*.

* *Elench. Hæretic. lib.* 12. 2. *Coloniæ* 1605.

noxious

noxious claſs of theſe ſectaries. So that there is nothing erroneous in *this part* of Dr. Horſeley's aſſertion, nor yet even ſingular (as Dr. P. ſeems to ſuppoſe) nor in contradiction to the words of Epiphanius or Jerom, or of any other eccleſiaſtical hiſtory †. The whole account of thoſe antients alſo is free both from *confuſion* and *inconſiſtency*; and it is only Dr. P. himſelf who has confounded the time, when thoſe fathers *ſuppoſe* the *ſingle apoſtle* St. John to have writ his Goſpel about the year 98, with the time of *the apoſtles* before the year 70: for as I ſaid before, whether the fathers are right in regard to the fact of St. John's writing his Goſpel ſo late, is altogether foreign from the queſtion; and let that be as it will, it is the time when they *ſuppoſe* it to have been written, which fixes *their* date of the origin of the Ebionites. Now as to any Nazarenes mentioned by Epiphanius before the year 70 or 98, any perſon, who turns to Epiphanius will find, that they are mentioned by him *before* theſe dates as differing from orthodox Chriſtians in nothing more, than merely in the retention of Judaiſm; but that after their connexion with Elcſai, about the year 98, or ſooner, they are thenceforward mentioned by

† "I am really aſtoniſhed, that you ſhould have the aſſurance to aſſert all this, ſo directly contrary to every thing, that appears upon the face of eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, and which muſt have been borrowed from your own imagination only—Epiphanius ſpeaks ſufficiently plain for my purpoſe—that the Ebionites and Nazarenes were a *formidable ſect* in the time of *the apoſtles*." Lett. to Dr. H. part 2. p. 15. 16. 18.

him

him as being corrupted into *heterodox Nazarenes*, therefore called by him later Nazarenes, on purpoſe to diſtinguiſh them from thoſe former ones, who were not heterodox in *doctrine:* this then is again perfectly conſiſtent with the account of Epiphanius, that it was not until *after* the retreat of the Chriſtians to Pella upon the capture of Jeruſalem by Titus in the year 70, that the αρχη, or origin of the *later Nazarenes*, as *heterodox ſectaries* took place ||. But thus it is that altercation is multiplied, when writers of ability pay ſo little attention to truth at firſt, and are ſo averſe from correcting their errors afterwards; I have not obſerved a ſingle error, which Dr. P. made in the defence of his *Hiſtory of Corruptions*, which is not continued uncorrected in his new *Hiſtory of early Opinions:* He muſt go on, if he chooſes, to aſſert that he has read the Fathers through *with as much care* as was requiſite; but errors ſimilar to thoſe diſplayed above, make all his readers ſtare with aſtoniſhment at almoſt every page, both in regard to what he ſo confidently aſſerts that he has read in the Fathers, and alſo at what he *has omitted* to read there. In fact, I have always found ancient writers, both profane, and even thoſe eccleſiaſtic ones, whom Dr. P. pronounces ignorant and credulous, to be much more conſiſtent with themſelves, with others, and with probability, than modern diſputants pretend; whoſe object it has been, after making *enormous over-*

|| "Poſt illam ab Hieroſolymis ſeceſſionem Chriſtianorum ad Pellam anno 70,—inde Nazaræorum hæreſis habebat principium. *Epiph. Hær.* 29.

*ſights*

*ſights* themſelves, or taking up ſome romantic ſyſtem to defend, in conſequence to accuſe the ancients of inconſiſtency, ignorance, and credulity, whenever their accounts do not favor ſuch modern viſions. This effect of the ſpirit of diſputation is very detrimental to literature; for as Mr. Gibbon has rightly obſerved, and it were to be wiſhed, that he had never verified his own obſervation, "an error may be committed in three or four words, which cannot be rectified in leſs than thirty or forty lines §:" and after all perhaps many will not ſee to what important conſequences theſe errors lead, nor be freed from all doubt and perplexity about the reality of them; for no preciſion of words can clear up the confuſed ideas of ſome readers, nor guard againſt the miſrepreſentations of ſome prejudiced writers, eſpecially in an age ſo fond of novel paradoxes as this; to which the ſame defect may in general be objected, as by Quintilian to Ovid, that it is *nimium amator ingenii ſui.*

Having thus vindicated the chronology of Epiphanius in regard to the *origin* of the Ebionites and Nazarenes from the accuſations of *confuſion* and *inconſiſtency*; we ſhall be the better prepared to diſcern, whether Dr. P. has not equally departed from truth with reſpect to the *tenets*, which Epiphanius aſcribes to the Ebionites, as in regard to the *time* of their origin. I ſhall however further obſerve *in general* upon the preceding ſubject, that we have already

§ Vindication, &c. p. 72.

found

found the *Time* of the origin of theſe *heterodox Sectaries* to be not very favorable to the pretentions of the Humaniſts, that their doctrine contained original Chriſtianity; for we have been able to diſcover no *certain* traces of the exiſtence of either of the ſects *before* the acceſſion of Trajan in the year 98, that is 70 years after the death of Chriſt; but on the contrary ſome indications have occurred, that the moſt obnoxious claſs of the Ebionites had a ſtill later origin; more eſpecially, in caſe there never was any ſuch perſon as Ebion, which negative Dr. P. maintains. For it is only the *earlier* exiſtence of Ebion than the year 98, which gives a *preſumption*, that *before* this year he *muſt have* had ſome diſciples of the ſame opinion with himſelf concerning the generation of Jeſus by Joſeph: but this preſumption is deſtroyed, if no ſuch perſon as Ebion ever really exiſted, whom Epiphanius mentions as the original author of the ſect; juſt as the ſhadow is removed the moment that we take away the ſubſtance which cauſed it. Neither Epiphanius, as we ſhall ſee, nor any other writer expreſſly affirms, that the claſs of Ebionites, who held Jeſus to be ſon of Joſeph, was *prior* to the other claſs, who held the miraculous conception; but where there was a teacher, we naturally *preſume*, that there were alſo diſciples taught by him: and this preſumption is all the teſtimony which we have of the priority of this claſs of Ebionites before the other; yet at the moſt even this claſs could have exiſted only during part of the ſhort interval between 70 and 98. Now when a reaſoner appeals to *Hiſtory*, he ought to abide by

*Hiſtory* and not *make* and *unmake* Hiſtory, juſt as he pleaſes; but in no *antient* author whatever will any account be found of the exiſtence of either Ebion or Ebionites or *heterodox* Nazarenes before the dates above ſpecified, which were not, as Dr. P. has erroneouſly affirmed, *during* the time of *the apoſtles*, but much later; and later than the ſect of Gnoſtics, who believed the divinity of the Chriſt: theſe therefore might juſt as well put in their claim to original Chriſtianity, in caſe the mere circumſtance of antiquity could decide the queſtion; and the firſt Gnoſtics were Jews likewiſe as well as the Ebionites and *later* Nazarenes. This *hiſtorical* argument then of Dr. P. ſets out at the very firſt with an erroneous ſtatement of *Facts*; neither ſhall we find it more conſiſtent with Truth in its progreſs afterwards concerning *Tenets*.

---

*That Epiphanius aſcribes a belief in the pre-exiſtence and divinity of the Chriſt and his union with the human Jeſus at Baptiſm, juſt as much to Ebion himſelf and the firſt claſs of Ebionites as to the ſecond claſs; whether thoſe called the firſt claſs exiſted before the other or not.*

THAT a belief in the divinity of the Chriſt, which is here aſcribed by me to Ebion himſelf, does neither depend upon the *ſingle* teſtimony of Epiphanius among the antients, nor is any *ſingular* opinion of my own among the moderns I have proved already; but I ſhall here ſubjoin the following farther evidence to

*both*

*both* theſe facts from Vitringa *. From this paſſage then we find, that Vitringa does not appeal to the *ſingle* teſtimony of Epiphanius; neither does he attribute a belief in the *divinity* of the Chriſt only to the ſecond claſs of the Ebionites, but juſt as much to Ebion himſelf and to the firſt claſs of his followers as to the ſecond. What apology then can Dr. P. make for thus departing from Truth and thus miſleading his readers by a repreſentation of this being only a ſingular and favorite hypotheſis of my own, which, we thus find, to be near a hundred years old; and which is alſo no *hypotheſis* at all, but, as Vitringa ſuggeſts, the neceſſary reſult of ſuch *hiſtoric evidence*, as is ſtill extant? When therefore in my *Preface* I mentioned ſome parts of my *diſcourſe*, as containing ſomething *new* in them, I meant only in regard to the ſtage of public debate on this ſubject; for the fact concerning the belief of Ebion in the divinity of the Chriſt, had been intirely *omitted* by Dr. P. in his *Hiſtory of Corruptions*, imperfectly *hinted* at by Dr. Horſeley; erroneouſly attributed by Waterland to *ſome* only of the

* "Cerinthus & Ebion, ſeu potius Ebionæi—non Chriſto Jeſu omnem abnegarunt *divinitatem*, quippe qui omnino docuerunt quantum mihi *ex Hiſtoriæ monumentis*, quæ ſuperſunt, liquere potuit, præſtantiorem quandam ſubſtantiam ſpiritualem, ſeu potius ſpiritum ſanctum, quem illi Chriſtum vocabant, ſe Jeſu *univiſſe*, quo tempore munus ſuum publicum auſpicaretur; tantum ſtatuerunt conjunctionem utriuſque naturæ divinæ & humanæ non fuiſſe continuam." *Obſerv. Sacr. lib.* 5. c. 5. *Sect.* 7. *Franequeræ* 1711.

Ebionites, and though affirmed by Vitringa in its full and proper extent, yet neither *proved* by him nor by any other writer: thus far then the following proofs in this ſection are *new*, as well as in my diſcourſe. Dr. P. indeed, ſince the time of my bringing this ſubject into public notice in my diſcourſe, has now at laſt thought proper to give *ſome* account in his *new hiſtory* concerning the belief of thoſe pretended original Chriſtians, the Ebionites, in the divinity of the Chriſt; yet it is ſtill ſuch an imperfect, partial and erroneous account, as only proves with what reluctance a writer ſees any thing in any Author, which contradicts his own former ill-founded aſſertions: in this reſpect then again he has no claim to the title of an *Hiſtorian*, but only of a public Diſputer in religious controverſy, as the following *remarks on Epiphanius* will farther prove.

Epiphanius begins his account of the hereſy of the Ebionites with a *general* ſketch of their tenets, before he proceeds to a more *particular* delineation of them; to various disjointed expreſſions in this *general* ſketch Dr. P. has referred in his *two hiſtories* and tracts againſt Dr. H. but he ſeems ſcarcely ever to have conceived any tolerable idea of the meaning of the Author whom he quotes: I ſhall therefore here give a paraphraſe of what Epiphanius does in that paſſage really ſay and mean, in order that the ſenſe of the ſeveral parts may appear with the greater preciſion by their being thus placed in a connected ſucceſſion; for when a reaſoner extracts only a few words out of a *whole* period, they may be eaſily diſtorted to meanings very different

rent from the intention of their author. Epiphanius then ſays "we may thus ſketch out the belief of Ebion in a *general* way; he held the principle of the Samaritans in regard to their having an abomination of the *bodies* of men as being impure, in caſe they were of any other ſect or nation, the ſame alſo in regard to dead bodies of every kind: he retained however the name of a Jew, together with the *general ſyſtem* of tenets held by the Oſſenes, Nazorenes and Nazirites, after they had added Chriſtian opinions to thoſe which they held before merely as Jewiſh Sectaries;* except that Ebion formed a different *ſpecies* under that *genus* by means of what he borrowed from the Cerinthians reſpecting the generation of Jeſus by Joſeph: to theſe ſpeculative opinions he added the practical immorality of the Carpocratians, and yet after all affected the appellation of a Chriſtian; for indeed as to the actions of a Chriſtian, or the *true ſyſtem* of chriſtian tenets and religious knowledge, together with the uniform conſent of the goſpels and apoſtles in the ſame chriſtian Faith, he paid no regard to theſe matters.—This Ebion was cotemporary with thoſe other Sectaries abovemen-

* Epiphanius makes the ſame orthographic difference in Greek between *Nazorenes* and *Nazirites* (Ναζωραιοι—Ναζιραιοι) as he found that the Jews did between *Nazorim* and *Nazirim*; a diſtinction which the Rabbinical Jews ſtill preſerve; meaning by the former name *Nazarenes*, that is, Chriſtians ſo called from *Nazoreth* in Galilee, and by the latter name *Nazirites* they mean a ſecluded Jewiſh body or ſect among themſelves derived from the ſenſe *Sanctified*, which the Hebrew word expreſſes.

tioned, the Offenes, Nazorenes and Nazirites, he aroſe from among them, and became conſpicuous along with them. Now what he *firſt* and principally maintained was, that Chriſt [ Jeſus ] was generated by commerce with a man, that is Joſeph, as I have already ſignified above, namely, that Ebion, *agreeing* with thoſe other ſects, the Offenes, Nazorenes and Nazirites in *all other* articles, *differed* from them only in this *ſingle* point concerning the generation of Jeſus by Joſeph, which he had borrowed from the Cerinthians: in regard to his conformity to the Law of Judaiſm with reſpect to the obſervance of the Sabbath and circumciſion and all other ceremonies (which are eſtabliſhed among the Jews and Samaritans) all theſe articles *moreover* Ebion maintained, even more ſtrictly than they are obſerved among the Jews themſelves, and more after the ſcrupulous manner of the Samaritans; for he added a reſtraint from touching any perſon of any other race—together with celibacy and abſtinence from fleſh as among thoſe other ſects, which are ſimilar in this reſpect (namely the Jewiſh ſectaries called Offenes and Nazirites) for at firſt all of theſe Heretics boaſted much of celibacy on account of James the brother of the Lord.—The Origin of this ſect of Ebion was after the retreat of the Jewiſh Chriſtians from Jeruſalem to Pella at the time of its being beſieged by Titus; in conſequence of which ſeceſſion they became intermixed at Pella with thoſe ſectaries from Judaiſm abovementioned, who had been ſettled there before—from whence aroſe alſo the *later* or corrupted ſect of Nazarenes,

renes, mentioned by me under the preceeding Hereſy as being now by the edict of Adrian deprived of all poſſibility of conforming any longer to the Moſaic Law, in regard to their going up to worſhip at Jeruſalem and the obſervance of other Jewiſh inſtitutions."*

To this paraphraſe I ſubjoin the original Greek and Dr. Prieſtley's tranſlation of various

* Σαμαρειτων μεν γαρ (Εβιων) εχει το βδελυρον, Ιουδαιων δε το ονομα, Οσσαιων δε και Νασωραιων και Νασαραιων την Γνωμην, Κηρινθιανων το ειδος, Καρποκρατιανων την κακοτροπιαν και Χριστιανων βουλεται εχειν την προσηγοριαν· ου γαρ δηπουθεν την τε πραξιν και την γνωμην και την γνωσιν και την των Επαγγελιων και αποστολων περι πιστεως συγκαλαθεσιν——Σαμαρειτης μεν ουν ων δια της βδελυριας, τουνομα αρνειται——Ουτος γαρ ὁ Εβιων συγχρονος μεν τουτων ὑπηρχεν, απ αυτων δε συν αυτοις ὁρμαται. Τα πρωτα δε εκ παρα τριβης και σπερματος ανδρος, τουτεστι του Ιωσηφ, τον χριστον γεγενησθαι ελεγεν, ὡς και ηδη ημιν προειρηται, ὁτι τα ισα τοις αλλοις εν απασι φρονων, εν τουτῳ μονῳ διεφερετο· εν τω τω νομω του Ιουδαισμου προσανεχειν και σαββατισμον και και την περιτομην και τα αλλα παντα (οσαπερ παρα Ιουδαιοις και Σαμαρειταις επιτελειται) ετι δε πλειω Ουτος παρα τους Ιουδαιους ὁμοιως τοις Σαμαρειταις διαπρατταται, προσεθετο γαρ το παραιρεισθαι ἀπτεσθαι τινων των αλλοεθνων——Και πωτε παρθενιαν εσεμνυνετο δηθεν δια Ιακωβον τον αδελφον του κυριε —γεγονε ἡ αρχη τουτου μετα την των Ιεροσολυμων ἁλωσιν— ὁθεν δηθεν και ὁι Νασαρηνοι ὁι ανομοι προδεδηλωνται.

"Ebion borrowed his abominable rites from the Samaritans, his opinion (γνωμην) from the Nazarenes, his name from the Jews, &c.—he was cotemporary with the former, and had the ſame origin with them; and firſt he aſſerted that Chriſt was born by the commerce and ſeed of man, namely, Joſeph, as we ſignified above," referring to the firſt words of his firſt ſection, "when we ſaid that in other reſpects he agreed with them all, and differed from them only in

parts of it, that by a compariſon of them all together readers may ſee how often he not only loſes, but intirely inverts the meaning of the Author's words; whereby they may judge both whether he has read through thoſe Fathers, whom he quotes, *with as much care as ſeemed to be required*, and alſo whether by ſo diſtorting their meaning it is not poſſible to prove from them juſt any thing which any man pleaſes. Let us proceed then to juſtify the ſenſe, which I have any where given to the greek words in queſtion; which although it may not always be the *neceſſary* ſenſe of them, will nevertheleſs be always found a ſenſe of which they are juſt as well *capable* as of any other; and when different ſenſes offer, we certainly ought to prefer that which makes a conſiſtent meaning out of the words, and one conſiſtent alſo with the ſame author's words elſewhere. When after this manner the ſeveral parts of this paſſage ſhall be rightly tranſlated and agreeably to the connexion and ſyntax of the greek, it will appear truly wonderful how Dr. P. could ſo much miſtake the meaning and grammatical conſtruction of the whole: yet ſuch however is too often the conſequence of diſſolving the connexion of periods by quoting different parts of them ſepa-

this, viz. in his adherence to the laws of the Jews with reſpect to the Sabbath, circumciſion, and other things that were enjoined by the Jews and Samaritans. He moreover adopted many more things than the Jews, in imitation of the Samaritans," the particulars of which he then proceeds to mention. *Hiſt. of Opin. Vol.* 3 180. and literally the ſame in *Let. to Dr. H. part* 1. *p.* 15.

rately;

rately; whereby the prejudices of the tranſlator have room to intermix themſelves and to pervert the words to ſuch meanings as ſhall beſt ſuit with his own wiſhes.

In regard to the firſt ſentence Εβιων εχει Σαμαρειτων το Βδελυρον Dr. P. renders it "Ebion borrowed his abominable rites from the Samaritans." Now if an ignorant Chriſtian Father had really ſaid this, how ready might Dr. P. have been to inſinuate, that this was only the malicious inſinuation of an enemy to the Ebionites? But luckily it is only a miſtake in Dr. P. himſelf; for Epiphanius does not attribute any thing *abominable* to the *rites* either of the Ebionites or Samaritans; he only notices the *abomination* in which thoſe two ſanctified ſects held the *bodies* of all the reſt of mankind, or as he ſtyles this practice ſoon after (Βδελυρια Σαμαρειτων) *the ſyſtem of the Samaritans in holding all the reſt of men except themſelves in abomination:* for they conceived the *bodies* of all men to be polluted and defiled, except thoſe, who had been brought up in their own religion, juſt as the ſeveral Caſts of the Hindoos do at this very day. That this was the meaning of Epiphanius, and that no ſuch idea ever entered his head as that of either charging the Ebionites or the Samaritans with any *abominable rites*, appears from the account which he gives of this their conceit of purity in themſelves, when treating of the hereſy of the Samaritans "Pollutionem putant, ſi quemquam alterius ſectæ attingant, vel alterius gentis" (p. 26) *To touch or be touched by thoſe of any other ſect or nation they conſidered as a pollution.* The ſame alſo he proceeds

proceeds to ſhew was the caſe, if they touched dead bodies even of their own ſect; which they carried ſo far as to ſhut themſelves up in their houſes, when a dead body was carried through the ſtreets: hence aroſe their cuſtom of uſing ſo many lotions with water, and the almoſt divine reverence which they paid to water, as alſo the Hindoos do for the ſame reaſon; the ſame was moreover the foundation of their abſtinence from animal food, and of their reſpect for celibacy.* If we did not know with certainty that ſuch ſuperſtitious *abominations* are ſtill in full force among the Hindoos, Dr. P. perhaps will firſt maintain here, as he does actually in his *Hiſt. of Opin.* that theſe *allegations of Epiphanius are highly improbable*, and after this will conclude, that they *cannot* be true. This is the new mode of writing *Hiſtories* which has been recommended by the pens of Mr. Gibbon and Dr. Prieſtley; Epiphanius and others have been often condemned as ignorant and credulous upon as little and even leſs foundation. As to the word employed by Epiphanius to expreſs this ſuperſtitious *abomination*, it is generally Βδελυττω and its derivatives. Thus in the *brief ſummary* prefixed to his account of the Samaritans in his firſt book, he mentions it as being their practice *to abominate the Heathens or other nations* (Βδελυττεσθαι τα εθνη Epiſt. ad Acacium p. 8). In his account of the Samaritans when relating their *abomination* of dead bodies he ſays Βδελυττονται ὁι νεκροι — νεκρον εβδελυγμενον — μη Βδελυττομενη, *Sect.* 4. The Doſitheans were a

* See alſo my note at p. 30; and Dr. P's errors in *Hiſt. of Opin. Vol.* 3. 205. and *Epiph. ſect.* 15. *de Ebion.*

ſect

ſect of Samaritans, and they alſo (he ſays) retained the ſame cuſtom *to abominate all men* Βδελυττεσθαι παντα ανθρωπον p. 30. In the ſame manner he employs Βδελυττονται and Βδελυκτους at p. 139, that is, as meaning perſons having an *abomination of others*, not as having any thing *abominable in their own rites*; and ſuch is the true ſenſe here of the το Βδελυρον and the Βδελυριαι of the Samaritans; as may be alſo ſtill farther confirmed from this very paſſage under conſideration: for we here find Epiphanius ſaying "that Ebion added a reſtraint from touching any perſon of any other nation;" and in his *Summary* to the ſame book, he mentions concerning the Ebionites, "that they abominated animal food" σαρκοφαγιαν Βδελυττονται *Synopſis lib.* 1. *tom.* 2. *ſect.* 10. Theſe ſeveral paſſages explain each other and at the ſame time illuſtrate what the nature of thoſe ſuperſtitious practices were, which Ebion had borrowed from the Samaritans, and which appear to have been likewiſe more or leſs *common* to the Oſſenes and Nazarites, and even to the Nazarenes alſo, that is, to the *later* Nazarenes, who had been corrupted by a commerce with the abovementioned other ſuperſtitious ſects at Pella, and with Elcſai; ſome of whoſe own followers held a ſimilar abſtinence from animal food, with the uſe of many ablutions and a kind of divine veneration of water.* The Hindoos

* "Elceſaitarum aliqui ab animatis omnibus abſtinent—aquam valde venerantur ac propemodum inſtar numinis habent." *Epiph. de Elſeſaitis Hær.* 53.

have

have a ſimilar divine veneration for the water of the Ganges, and this apparently ariſing from a ſimilar ſyſtem of *abominating* ſuppoſed pollutions. What then is there *ridiculous* in Epiphanius's faithfully relating the ſuperſtitions of others? The only thing really unreaſonable is, that theſe famous Ebionites ſhould be ſet up by Dr. P. as true patterns of original Chriſtianity; and that ſuch labored attempts ſhould be made to exculpate them from the ſuperſtitious and abſurd opinions, which Hiſtory aſcribes to them.

We come next to conſider what Ebion borrowed from the Oſſenes, Nazarenes and Nazirites; and in regard to theſe we ſhall find, that Dr. P. has as much departed from truth and from the meaning of Epiphanius as concerning the Samaritans. Now Epiphanius ſays, that Ebion held the γνωμη of thoſe three ſects: Dr. P. tranſlates that word *the opinion* of the Nazarenes, as if he meant a *ſingle opinion*, becauſe γνωμη is in the ſingular number: Γνωμη *may* indeed mean a ſingle opinion, but it does not

" A ſacrificiis abhorreant, neque re ulla animata veſcantur." *Epiph. de Naziritis. Hær.* 18.

" Sacrificia condemnant—Judæos improbent qui carnibus veſcerentur—per cælum, *Aquam*, &c. dejerant." *Epiph. de Oſſenis. Hær.* 19, & *de Ebion. ſect.* 15.

Hence we ſee how the ſame ſuperſtitions pervaded all theſe Jewiſh ſects tho' converted to Chriſtianity. Dr. P. then has no cauſe to wonder that the Ebionites worſhipped *water*; ſince we find, that they had borrowed alſo from the ſame Jewiſh Sectaries their ſyſtem of abominating animals and their ablutions, yet Dr. P. admits his *wonder* into *Hiſt. of Opin. vol.* 3. 206.

*neceſſarily*

*neceſſarily* imply that ſenſe; for it is uſed by all the Fathers to mean a *ſyſtem of opinions*, i. e. either the *whole* or the *chief body* of tenets of any ſect*. In the ſame plural ſenſe it *muſt be* employed here viz, as implying "that Ebion borrowed *in general* the *ſyſtem* of the Oſſenes, Nazarenes and Nazirites, excepting ſo far as he *differed* from them by what he borrowed from the Cerinthians." That this was his meaning is proved with certainty afterwards in this very paſſage, where he again mentions and at the ſame time intimates his having mentioned *before*, that Ebion *agreed in all things* with the Oſſenes, &c. except in regard to a *ſingle opinion*, which he borrowed from the Cerinthians; whereby he formed a *new ſpecies* (ειδος) under the *general ſyſtem* of thoſe Sectaries: for every *ſpecies* reſembles its reſpective *genus* in moſt articles and only *differs* in ſome few particularities; as Epiphanius here expreſsly ſays was the caſe in regard to what Ebion borrowed from Cerinthus, namely, that hereby he *differed* from the *general ſyſtem* of the Oſſenes, &c. only in the ſingle article of holding Jeſus to be the ſon of Joſeph, which article he had borrowed from Cerinthus, (εν τουτῳ μονῳ διεφερετο). That theſe laſt Greek

* Εισιν αυτων οἱ μεν τινες καλουμενοι Μαρκιανοι, οἱ δε Ουαλεντινιανοι, &c. απο του αρχηγετου της γνωμης εκατος ονομαζομενος. *Juſtin. Dial. Tryph.*

Αναγκαιον ἡγησαμην—Ουαλεντινε μαθητων την γνωμην μηνυσαι σοι. Neceſſarium duxi—Valentini diſcipulorum *ſyſtema* manifeſtare tibi. *Irenæus in præfat.*

Ζητουντος σε μαθειν την γνωμην αυτων [i. e. των περι Πτολομαιον] ibid. Quærenti tibi diſcere *ſyſtema* eorum, viz. diſcipulorum Ptolomæi &c.

words

words are thus to be conſtructed along with the *preceeding* member of the period, and not, as Dr. P. erroneouſly does, with the *ſucceeding* member of it, is ſufficiently evident from the connexion and conſiſtency of the whole ſenſe, as well as from the proper grammatical conſtruction of the particular Greek words: for the *ſucceeding* member of the period forms a whole and complete ſenſe by itſelf, which is diſturbed and totally inverted, if the words εν τουτω μονω διεφερετο be conſtructed along with it in the erroneous manner of Dr. Prieſtley; and as the firſt member of the period is introduced by τα πρωτα *firſt of all*, ſo the ſecond member is connected and ſubjoined by ετι *moreover*.* By this right conſtruction of εν τουτω μονω διεφερετο along with the *preceeding* member of the period another difficulty alſo is removed, which has embarraſſed Dr. Horſeley as well as Dr. Prieſtley, that is, to what *foregoing ſentence* Epiphanius meant to refer by theſe words ως και ηδη ημιν προειρηται *as I have ſignified above*. Now *where* has he ſaid any ſuch thing *above*? Dr. P. ſays, that *he refers to the firſt words of his firſt Section*: but no ſuch aſſertion can be found there as that Jeſus was the ſon of Joſeph; nor any thing elſe relative to the purpoſe. Dr. Horſeley, not be-

* It muſt be allowed however, that Petavius in his Latin tranſlation had ſet the example of this error, by which probably Dr. P. was miſled; his words are "Cum diximus Ebionem—hac una re diſcrepare, quod Judæorum ritus amplexus eſt &c." Thus Dr. Prieſtley's vaſt concluſions from this paſſage have no better foundation than a mere miſtake in the Latin tranſlation of it.

ing

ing able to find *above* in Epiphanius the words referred to, has recourſe to the ſuppoſition of a parentheſis, which makes but a harſh conſtruction. Yet the *words above*, to which Epiphanius refers, ſeem to be ſufficiently obvious, and are theſe Εβιων εχει—Κηρινθιανων το ειδος "Ebion holds—the *general* ſyſtem of the Nazarenes &c yet agreeably however to the *particular ſpecies* of the Cerinthians:" this is the ſame as to ſay, that "Ebion holds—Jeſus to be the ſon of Joſeph," for this opinion had been mentioned *before* by Epiphanius as being the *particular ſpecies* of Chriſtianity held by the Cerinthians. As for inſtance, when he had juſt *before* treated of the hereſy of Cerinthus, he ſays that according to this ſectary "Chriſtum è Maria Joſephique ſemine eſſe prognatum:" and immediately afterwards in the hereſy of the *Nazarenes*, he adds "De Chriſto certò affirmare nequeo, utrum Nazareni impietate illa Cerinthi predicta Decepti, merum hominem aſſeverent." Here we ſee, that he conſiders the mere humanity of Jeſus as being the Cerinthian *ſpecies* of Chriſtianity; and theſe words are only in the preceeding leaf and hereſy to thoſe now under conſideration relative to the *Ebionites*; wherein he affirms that Ebion actually did hold *Cerinthianorum ſpeciem doctrinæ de Chriſto*, juſt as before he acknowledged, that he had no authority to ſay, that the Nazarenes ever did; which is therefore the ſame as to affirm, that *Ebion held Jeſus to be the Son of Joſeph.* The connexion between theſe ſeveral paſſages ſeems ſo clearly to illuſtrate the meaning of Epiphanius, in his brief expreſſion Κηρινθιανων το ειδος, that I cannot ſee how any

any doubt can remain about it; but this is a meaning, of which Dr. P. has given no intimation, nor could his readers diſcover it, becauſe in his detached quotations from this paſſage, he has *entirely omitted* to tranſcribe thoſe words Κηρινθιανων το ειδος: this is indeed often the unfortunate conſequence of making ſuch detached quotations, and then tacking them together in ſenſe ſo as to make out ſomething plauſible in favour of a reaſoner's own argument, although directly contraty to the real ſenſe of the writer quoted. If ſuch then be the ſenſe implied by Κηρινθιανων το ειδος, it becomes evident, that it muſt be to *theſe words*, that Epiphanius refers afterwards, when he ſays *as I have ſignified above*; and he proceeds accordingly to recapitulate ſtill more of *what he had ſaid above*, namely, " that Ebion agreed with the *general* chriſtian ſyſtem of the Oſſenes, Nazarenes and Nazirites *in all things* (εν πασι) except that he *differed* from them in that *ſingle point* only, which formed the ſubſtance of the *Cerinthian ſpecies*, i. e. that Jeſus was generated by Joſeph, and not by a miraculous conception, as the Oſſenes and Nazarenes believed; which expreſſion εν 'πασι illuſtrates further and determines the plural ſenſe of γνωμα Ναζωραιων, as implying the *general ſyſtem* of thoſe ſectaries. Whereas on the contrary Dr. P. by conſtructing εν τετω μονω διαφερετο along with the ſentence, which *follows* it, inſtead of that which *precedes*, makes Epiphanius ſay " that Ebion *differed* from the Nazarenes, Oſſenes aud Nazirites *only* in regard to their obſervance of the Moſaic rites of circumciſion and the ſabbath and others obſerved

ſerved by the Jews;" but it is certain, that thoſe ſects did not differ from each other in ſuch points, the Moſaic rites being equally adhered to by all of them, and even the additional Samaritan ſuperſtitions held by any one of them were *equally* held by *all* the reſt, as I have already ſhewn in part by their *common abomination* of men, animals, dead bodies and ſacrifices, together with their *common* reverence for water, baptiſms and ablutions; and this might be confirmed farther, if neceſſary. Thus then this whole paſſage in Epiphanius ſeems to be perfectly cleared from embaraſſment and even from all appearance of inconſiſtency; and this has been effected only by the inartificial expedient of endeavoring firſt of all to underſtand it, and to connect rightly the ſeveral members of it together; inſtead of merely *conjecturing at random*, and *ſuppoſing it probable*, that he meant this and that, whereby Dr. P. has made meanings for the author, which he never meant. Dr. P. adviſes me to "bluſh on reflection;"* now I ſhould indeed have bluſhed, if I had writ in ſuch an offenſive manner concerning the common tenets of all Chriſtians for 1700 years, concerning the fidelity and underſtanding of their teachers, together with the maliciouſneſs, ignorance and ridiculouſneſs of the Fathers, and yet after all have been under the neceſſity of appealing in ſupport of ſuch heavy accuſations, to ſuch weak authorities as various detached parts of a ſhort paſſage in one of theſe ignorant

* In his *Remarks* on my *diſcourſe* in Lett. to Dr. Horſely, part 3. p. 89.

Fathers, but ſo tranſlated as ſcarcely ever to preſent the leaſt true idea of his meaning, and often totally to invert the ſenſe of the moſt material part of his words.

As to any *concluſions*, which Dr. P. has endeavored to deduce from the above words of Epiphanius, after being miſinterpreted by himſelf, it would be almoſt endleſs to follow him in theſe, ſince he always takes ſo very wide a range in his reaſonings, by the aid of *ſuppoſitions*, and pretended *Probabilities*, which are no way probable; but it is moreover in this caſe unneceſſary, becauſe when the premiſſes are erroneous, the concluſions from them muſt be inconcluſive. I ſhall only obſerve then in general, that the two chief articles, which he labors to deduce from the above paſſage are, that the Nazarenes were originally the ſame claſs of ſectaries with the Ebionites; and that the Nazarenes did not differ from the Ebionites in regard to the tenet of Jeſus being mere man from Joſeph.* Yet *both* of theſe *concluſions* are clearly diſproved by the above paſſage. For in regard to the *firſt*, it appears, that the Ebionites compoſed their creed partly out of that of the Nazarenes, and partly from that of the Cerinthians; therefore they muſt have been *originally* a different claſs of believers from either of the other two: and yet in the time of Origen an hundred years afterwards both ſects might very poſſibly be commonly known by the name of Ebionites; juſt as many perſons at

* See Lett. to Dr. H. part 1. p. 14. and Hiſt. of Opin. Vol. 3. 164. and 180.

this

this day include under the name of Preſbyterians, not only the original Preſbyterians, but alſo Independents, Unitarians, rational Chriſtians, and thoſe who are no Chriſtians at all, without making any diſtinction in regard to the difference of their ſeveral tenets, but only by way of contradiſtinction from Epiſcopalians. And if Origen's words be attended to, it ſeems evident, that he never meant to apply the appellation of Ebionites to the Jewiſh Chriſtians in general in any other than this looſe ſenſe; that is, juſt the ſame as the members of the Church of England are commonly called Calviniſts, meaning only as to their *general principles*; and not that they are lineally deſcended from the original Calviniſts in Switzerland, that they are the very ſame claſs of Chriſtians with no diſtinction between them in principles, ceremonies, or diſcipline. In like manner all Chriſtians, who retained the Jewiſh Law might naturally be denominated by the common appellation of Ebionites, notwithſtanding that they differed to the very laſt as much as *originally* in their ſeveral tenets and Chriſtian opinions. *See Hiſt. of Opin. Vol.* 3. 167. *& Ibid.* 164. As to the *ſecond* point, it is equally clear, that it was from the Cerinthians, that Epiphanius ſuppoſes the Ebionites to have borrowed the doctrine of Jeſus being the ſon of Joſeph, and that both of theſe ſects *differed* in this point from the *general ſyſtem* of the Nazarenes, Oſſenes and Nazirites; conſequently the latter three held the miraculous conception, as indeed Epiphanius ſufficiently indicates elſewhere when he is treating of each of thoſe three ſects in particular: except that with reſpect to

the Nazarenes he declares, that he had not received *information* and therefore could not determine, whether any of them had been ſeduced into the doctrine of Cerinthus or not concerning Jeſus being generated by Joſeph; and having thus declared *before* that he had *no authority* to charge them with this corruption,* he accordingly does not here *afterwards* charge them with it, but leaves this queſtion concerning them in the ſame indeterminate ſtate in which he had *before* placed it; and therefore ſends the Ebionites *expreſsly to the Cerinthians for this article of their belief.* This is not then "a doubt concerning the Nazarenes, which Epiphanius *afterwards* abandons;"† but it is a *deficiency of information*, which as he could not clear up, he leaves *defective*; conſequently nothing can be proved concerning this point from the above words *either way*; except that Epiphanius is not *inconſiſtent* with himſelf in this article, as I have ſhewn that he is not in others likewiſe. But in regard to the deſcent of the divine Chriſt, nothing relative to this queſtion is either men-

* "De Chriſto verò certò affirmare nequeo, utrum Nazareni decepti etiam predicta illa Cerinthi impietate, merum hominem aſſeverent, vel, ſicut veritas ſe habet, per ſpiritum ſanctum de Maria genitum eſſe fateantur." *Hær.* 29. *Sect.* 7.

† "This [the paſſage quoted above] amounts to no more, than a doubt, which he *afterwards* abandoned, by aſſerting, that the Ebionites held the ſame opinion concerning Chriſt with the Nazarenes, which opinion *he expreſsly ſtates to be their belief*, that Jeſus was a mere man, and the Son of Joſeph." *Hiſt of Opin. Vol.* 3. *p.* 182.

tioned

tioned or implied in the above paſſage concerning any of the ſectaries there treated of: yet we cannot thence *conclude*, that this tenet was not held by them; for we know with certainty, that it was held by Cerinthus, the Oſſenes, Nazirites and Elceſaites, together with the *ſecond* claſs of Ebionites, who were tutored by Elcſai along with the later Nazarenes; it is therefore probable, that it was held by theſe later Nazarenes his diſciples likewiſe, as indeed ſome paſſages ſtill extant and preſerved by Jerom out of the Nazarene goſpel ſtrongly confirm. I ſhall proceed to prove from Epiphanius, that the ſame doctrine was held alſo by the *firſt* claſs of Ebionites and by Ebion himſelf. So that if there be not *abundant proofs* of this doctrine concerning any one particular ſect, yet at leaſt there are proofs of its being the doctrine of an *abundant number* of the firſt ſectaries; and indeed of all of them without exception during the firſt two centuries, not only of the above-mentioned Jewiſh ſectaries when turned Chriſtians but alſo of the Jewiſh and all other Gnoſtics: I muſt except perhaps Carpocrates, who does indeed ſeem to approach to the opinion of modern Unitarians the neareſt of any of the firſt ſectaries in regard to the mere Humanity of Jeſus *during his Miniſtry*; but then if he did not hold the deſcent of a divine Chriſt at baptiſm, yet he allowed the pre-exiſtence and ſuperangelic nature of the ſoul of Jeſus before his birth of Mary, notwithſtanding that he maintained his body to have been generated by Joſeph.

I have ſtill farther to obſerve in regard to the abovementioned paſſage, that the *general ſyſtem*

or γνωμαι there mentioned of the Offenes, and Nazirites muſt have included their ſyſtem of chriſtian tenets, as well as of thoſe, which they held before as merely Jewiſh ſects;* becauſe Epiphanius includes the Nazarenes along with them, who were never Jewiſh ſectaries, but only chriſtian ones: moreover, the ſame fact is proved more clearly by thoſe words afterwards, where Epiphanius ſpeaks of *all* theſe ſectaries having adopted celibacy out of reſpect to *James the brother of the Lord*; which is a certain evidence, that Epiphanius is all along ſpeaking of the *general ſyſtem* of thoſe Jewiſh ſectaries, as it exiſted after they had embraced Chriſtianity, and after the Nazarenes had joined themſelves to thoſe others; which was not until after the year 70, and in the time of Elcſai. Accordingly in the cloſe of that paſſage he informs us *at what time* and *by whom* that particular body of Jewiſh chriſtians, reſident at Pella were corrupted from orthodoxy; nevertheleſs probably they might not be *known among Chriſtians* by the name of Nazarenes until long after: and although he had *before* like a faithful hiſtorian allowed, that he had no authority or information to charge them with having been ſeduced by that *elder* corruption the *Cerinthian ſpecies* of Chriſtianity, which had according to the Fathers prevailed *before* the year 70; yet here and elſewhere Epiphanius as faithfully relates, that this particular body of Jewiſh Chriſtians at Pella, (but theſe however alone) did not reſiſt a corruption of their orthodoxy in a later period

* See Dr, Horſely's Lett. to Dr, P, part 1, p. 41.

by

by their intercourſe with Ebion and Elcſai *after* the year 70. But how far and in what reſpects they had imbibed the corruptions of either of thoſe perſonages does not appear; it only appears, that they were tainted by them: from ſome extracts however preſerved by Jerom out of the Goſpel of the Nazarenes, it ſhould ſeem, that they were corrupted moſt with ſome of the *fanciful notions* (or φαντασιαι, as Epiphanius calls them) of Elcſai concerning the Chriſt and the Holy Spirit; for in one of theſe extracts Jeſus calls the *Holy Spirit his Mother*, and ſays, "that ſhe took him up by one of the hairs of his head and carried him to the top of mount Tabor."* Is this conſiſtent with orthodoxy? It is however much of a piece with ſome of the other *fanciful notions* which Epiphanius relates concerning the opinions of Elcſai and his followers.†

Laſtly, there is one other expreſſion in the paſſage paraphraſed above, which requires illuſtration; this is the phraſe οἱ Ναζωραιοι οἱ ανομοι. Dr. P. quotes theſe words in his *Hiſt. of Opin. Vol.* 3. *p.* 181. but has not thought proper to tranſlate them: Petavius renders them by *impii Nazareni*; and if Dr. P. had as implicitly followed the Latin tranſlation of Petavius in this caſe, as he did in a former inſtance, he would again have been led by it into error. Dr. Horſely conceives, that it was not the Nazarene Chriſtians, who were here meant by Epiphanius,

* Αρτι ελαβε με η μητηρ μυ το ἁγιον πνευμα, εν μια των τριχων μυ, και απηνεγκε εις ορος το μεγα το θαβωρ. *Origen. Comment. in Johann.* and *Jerom, Comment. in Mich.* 7. 6.

† See Hiſt. of Opin. Vol. 3. 182.

but merely the Jewiſh ſectaries called Nazirites; and that Epiphanius calls them *lawleſs Nazirites*, becauſe they had rejected the Pentateuch as being not the compoſition of Moſes, but of later hands, and therefore that they had in ſome ſort rejected the Moſaic Law.* But it ſhould be remembered, that the ſame Epiphanius, who informs us of this, informs us at the ſame time, that thoſe ſectaries nevertheleſs adhered to all the Moſaic Laws obſerved time immemorially by their forefathers; as preſuming, that the Laws thus traditionally received had been more antient than the Pentateuch, which, as they alledged, had been compiled from them and not contrarywiſe the Laws derived from the Pentateuch. Other objections alſo to this ſenſe will readily occur from the date of the origin of the ſectaries here ſpoken of. But the beſt will be by pointing out the true cauſe of this epithet ἀνόμοι being given to the Nazarene Chriſtians; and this appears in the leaf immediately preceeding, which is occupied with an account of this *Hereſy* of the *Nazarenes*, and cloſes alſo with this very ſubject. Epiphanius there reaſoning againſt the Nazarenes for continuing to obſerve the Law of Moſes, alledges as one argument for their forſaking it "that they bind themſelves under a curſe to obſerve *all* the Law, when at the ſame time it is no longer within their power to obſerve that part of the Moſaic Law, which commands them to appear three times a year before the temple of the Lord at their three chief Feſtivals," meaning on account

* Dr. Horſely's Lett. to Dr. P. part 1. p. 49.

of

of the deſtruction of the Temple by Titus, and the edict of Adrian, which had forbid the approach of any Jew even to the ruins of the city; therefore inſtead of that circumlocution which he employs there μη δυναμενοι τον Νομον πληρωσαι, he ſignifies the ſame ſenſe in the next leaf afterwards by the more brief epithet of ανομοι.*

Having followed the Ebionites and Nazarenes in their hiſtory thus far, we will juſt attend them to the end of it. As Epiphanius allows that he had no *evidence* of his own or *authority* from others to charge the Nazarenes with being corrupted by that firſt and oldeſt error of the chriſtian ſectaries *before* the year 70, viz. *Cerinthianiſm*, this affords a *preſumption* at leaſt, that they had never been guilty of it and no evidence appears afterwards to the contrary; however he allows, that they were corrupted in later times about the year 98 by *Elceſaiſm:* yet this was only *one particular body* of them, who had remained at Pella, after the other Jewiſh Chriſtians, who had taken refuge there, had again left it, and one part of whom had returned to Jeruſalem *ſoon after* the capture of Jeruſalem by Titus in the year 70. So that there is no evidence extant, whereby to accuſe thoſe Jewiſh

* "Iſti aberrant, cum de circumciſione gloriantur; ac etiam execratione quadem obſtricti ſunt, *quod Legem obſervare nequeunt* (μη δυναμενοι το Νομον πληρωσαι) quomodo enim obſervare poterunt iſtud Legis mandatum *Ter quotannis apparebis coram Domino Deo tuo per Azymorum dies & Scenopegiam & Pentecoſten in Hieroſolymitano Loco?* Ab Legis enim obſervatione intercluſi ſunt & quæ ab ea præſcribuntur perfici amplius non poſſunt." *De Nazaræis Hær.* 29. *Sect.* 8.

Chriſ-

Chriſtians, who then quitted Pella, of any corruption of their *original* Chriſtianity, whatever it was. Jeruſalem being in ruins, could afford little invitation to them to return there; ſome however of them did return; but it was only a very *ſmall body*, as is evident from the account, which Epiphanius gives of their having only *one Church*, and that a *little one*.* Had the number been conſiderable, although the ruinous ſtate of Jeruſalem might not have afforded a large Church for them, yet they might have had ſeveral in different parts of the town; whereas it appears, that they had only *one ſmall one*, even when Adrian viſited the ruins of Jeruſalem in the year 129, about 60 years after its deſtruction by Titus. Hence we may ſafely conclude that the number of Jewiſh Chriſtians, who had ſettled at Jeruſalem were but few. Now when, by Adrian's edict for expelling all Jews from Jeruſalem, thoſe few Chriſtian Jews came to be diſperſed all over Paleſtine, and perhaps many in Egypt, Aſia and elſewhere; where could Origen, near an hundred years afterwards, namely, about the year 220, have been able to find any ſuch body of them together in any part of Paleſtine, as to authorize him to affirm, that thoſe Jewiſh Chriſtians ſtill exiſted. As to any viſible congregation of them in one place, there was not probably enough of them living in any one town to form a Congregation; but only

* "Adrian found Jeruſalem levelled to the ground, except a few buildings, and a ſingle Church of God, a ſmall one." και της τυ θευ εκκλησιας μικρης ουσης. *Epiph. de ponder. Sect.* 14. *p.* 170.

here

here and there a ſeparate and diſperſed family: and as the identical perſons, who had been expelled by Adrian muſt be then all dead, who could tell him what became of their children and families; eſpecialy as Origen from Egypt was a ſtranger to the language and natives of Paleſtine. If the congregation of a ſingle pariſh in England were diſperſed all over the iſland, who could ſay an hundred years afterwards, that any of their deſcendants ſtill exiſted? And yet many of them doubtleſs might be found by diligent enquiry, but not otherwiſe. Or if the Independants of Cromwell's time had been as few as the Jewiſh Chriſtians at Jeruſalem, and had become ſo diſperſed over England, as that no body of them was now to be found in any town to form a viſible congregation; could any foreigner, ignorant of our language and people, be able to affirm, that at preſent that ſect was ſtill exiſting? Would he not be apt to include them, even if any few were exiſting, under the general appellation of Preſbyterians or Diſſenters; notwithſtanding that thoſe few Independants ſtill preſerved their religious principles totally diſtinct from the Preſbyterians? For my own part then, I cannot find the leaſt grounds, either for *doubting* the veracity of Origen along with Dr. Horſely, becauſe he has *not mentioned particularly* the diſperſed deſcendants of thoſe few orthodox Jewiſh Chriſtians; nor yet for *concluding* along with Dr. Prieſtley that they had not been orthodox, becauſe Origen may have *included them* under the general appellation of Ebionites; by which name the Chriſtians adhering to Judaiſm were then beſt known to the

Greek

Greek Chriſtians*: for it was the circumſtance of adherence to Judaiſm or not, which was the cauſe of Origen's introducing what he has ſaid about them, and not the difference of their Chriſtian opinions. Beſides, as I obſerved before, Origen in calling them *Ebionites*, ſeems to have intended to ſignify nothing more than their *general* religious principles and *common* agreement of adhering to Judaiſm; juſt as we call both Calviniſts and Lutherans *Proteſtants*, and the French call both of them the *pretended reformed* without any diſtinction; becauſe they both agree in that *one point* of rejecting Popery, as the Ebionites, Nazarenes and remaining orthodox Jewiſh Chriſtians agreed in common in retaining Judaiſm. It certainly can never be concluded hence in either caſe, that there never had been any diſtinction between thoſe Judaiſing ſects, nor yet between theſe Antipapiſtic ſects. It may be added ſtill farther, that the civil diſperſion of the few Jewiſh Chriſtians by Adrian would be not improbably followed by a religious diſunion, which would leſſen their numbers ſtill more; for although men may be in apparent union, while collected in one body; yet the calamity of that diſperſion might make each individual follow his own inclination. Thoſe who regarded their chriſtian tenets, more than the Jewiſh Law, would naturally (as Dr. Horſeley ſuggeſts) join the Greek Church of

* Dr. Horſeley's Lett. to Dr. P. p. 55. Εβιωναιοι χρηματιζουσιν οι απο Ιουδαιων τον Ιησουν, ως χριστον, παραδεξαμενοι. *Orig. in Celſ. lib.* 2. And *Hiſt. of Opin. Vol.* 3. *p.* 167.

Chriſtians

Chriſtians at Jeruſalem or elſewhere, that they might be able outwardly to profeſs Chriſtianity, although they retained their Judaiſm in private; while on the contrary, thoſe who preferred Jndaiſm to Chriſtianity, would join the Jews, and outwardly profeſs Judaiſm, although they privately retained Chriſtianity: and others, who wiſhed to retain both religions in public, might perhaps join the Ebionites, and thereby increaſe the number of thoſe ſectaries, who publicly profeſſed both Judaiſm and Chriſtianity at the ſame time. Thus diſperſion would tend almoſt to annihilation one way or other, or at leaſt to the total obſcurity of that ſmall remaining body of Jewiſh Chriſtians from Jeruſalem, without any impeachment either of the veracity of Origen, or of the the original orthodoxy of that chriſtian body; and this even if we were to allow (what cannot be allowed) that the expreſſion of Origen implies a denial of his having any knowledge of ſuch orthodox Jewiſh Chriſtians being ſtill exiſting: for in fact in that paſſage referred to, he only tells us by what *general name* the Jewiſh Chriſtians of *all claſſes* were known to the Greek Chriſtians in his own age, and not whether there were not ſeveral different *particular* ſects, claſſes and perſons included under that general appellation. It might juſt as well be contended from Origen's words, that all the other ſects of Jewiſh Chriſtians ſuch as Cerinthians, Nazarenes, Melchiſedechians, Oſſenes and Nazirites were then totally exſtinct or never had exiſted, but the Ebionites only; as that a body of orthodox Jewiſh Chriſtians never had exiſted, becauſe that in the time of Origen

an

an hundred years after their diſperſion, Jewiſh Chriſtians of all claſſes began to be diſtinguiſhed by the *general* name of Ebionites (as being all in reſpect of Judaiſm Diſſenters from the Greek Church) on account of that being perhaps the moſt numerous claſs of ſuch Jewiſh Diſſenters then exiſting: juſt as the name of Preſbyterians is at preſent often uſed by many perſons to imply a great variety of different claſſes of Diſſenters, merely in contradiſtinction to Epiſcopalians. It is a ſign of a deſperate cauſe, when diſputants are thus forced to have recourſe for evidence againſt atteſted facts, to concluſions deduced from a few vague ſummary and ambiguous expreſſions in the Fathers, which may juſt as well mean ſomething very different, as that *particular ſenſe*, which ſuch diſputants wiſh to preſs out; and they would do well to remember an obſervation of Wetſtein, "Is it not reaſonable, that the balance ſhould incline in favor of Facts againſt Conjectures, rather than in favor of Conjectures againſt Facts?"* Theſe repeated miſtakes in the ſenſe of the words of Epiphanius and others firſt made their appearence in Dr. Prieſtley's *Letters to Dr. Horſely* (part 1. 16) but they have been all retained without amendment in his new *Hiſtory of Opinions, Vol.* 3. together with the addition of many others in the ſame correct taſte; and this notwithſtanding the profeſſion in his title page,

* "N'eſt-il pas juſte que la Balance panche vers le Fait contre la Conjecture, plutôt que vers la Conjecture contre la Fait?" *Biblioth. raiſonnèe tom.* 50. 367.

that

that this new work has been *compiled from the original writers*; which aſſertion therefore, we ſee, means juſt nothing at all. In vain will Dr. P. ſay, that ſuch overſights as diſplayed above do not affect any points of conſequence, ſince he has thought it worth while to introduce the concluſions drawn from them into his *new Hiſtory* as affording arguments of ſolidity in his favor. But ſuch is the adventurous ſpirit of Romance, that while it affects to deſpiſe antient Fathers and modern Dictionaries, and all other pedantic helps toward underſtanding the words one quotes, it too often overleaps all the boundaries of ſyntax and of ſenſe; and in its fanciful excurſions diſcovers new worlds of its own and new meanings, which were never meant, but have been only either conjured up by the reaſoner from the ſtrength of his own prejudices, or elſe have ariſen from ſuch an inattention, as is totally irreconcileable with a diligent enquiry after Truth: Fancy and Truth never yet made a happy alliance together. But hence we may learn in what labyrinths a fertile genius at diſputation is able to involve quotations from antient authors, if inſtead of ſearching cautiouſly after their real meaning, any one attempts to make plauſible meanings for them with the help of Dr. Prieſtley's ſlippery mode of interpretation by means of *conjectures and probabilities*: theſe are in fact only other names for the art of torturing an Author's words, until they ſhall be made to favor a Reaſoner's own prejudices; which permit him to ſee only juſt what he wiſhes to ſee, and not to find out what was intended to be expreſſed. Had I not reaſon then

in

in my *Diſcourſe* to guard lovers of truth againſt the abuſe of this dangerous talent of diſputation; which we thus find by experience to have a tendency rather to perplex than to illuminate the underſtanding of readers, and to obſcure rather than to illuſtrate the meaning of writers. Moſheim has an excellent lecture upon this ſubject.*

* " In rebus hiſtoricis, quum de veritate & falſitate rerum geſtarum quæritur, teſtium æqualium his que proximorum auctoritas (præſertim ſi conſentiens ac concors ſit) valere debet, niſi graviſſima quædam ratio aliud ſuadeat, & vel apertum ſit, doli mali ſuſpicione teſtes illos non carere, vel res ipſa vanitatem ſuam & falſitatem haud dubiis indiciis prodat, vel aliis denique ſignis conſtet, deceptos fuiſſe illos, a quibus res primum profecta eſt. Hâc regulâ nihil puto eſſe certius; quâ ſublatâ, quid demum ex veteri hiſtoria ſupererit, cui fidem habere tuto liceat? Si *coniecturis*, ingenioſis licet, vellicare atque deſtruere fas eſt teſtimonia certa inter ſe conſentientia ac evidentia, omnem mittamus rerum veterum curam, atque profiteamur, nihil certi de illis decerni atque conſtitui poſſe—Hâc in noſtra cauſâ tam firma ſatiſque probata auctoritas Scriptorum chriſtianorum, ſi *divinationibus* quibuſdam poſtponi debet, iiſque ex rebus ſumptis, quarum perfecta & abſoluta cognitione, propter monumentorum penuriam, deſtituimur; equidem neſcio, quid reſpondendum ſit illis veritatis hoſtibus ſacrorumque irriſoribus, qui origines chriſtianas cum veterum græcorum fabulis componunt, & obſcura eſſe omnia & incerta pronuntiant, quæ de illis memoriæ ſunt prodita: ex quibus id tantum aſſertione dignum habent, quod *ſingularibus ſuis uſibus & præjudicatis* inſervit *opinionibus*." *De Simone Mago Sect.* 11. *in Diſſert. eccleſiaſt. Vol.* 2. *Altonæ* 1767.

At p. 47 in a note *add*, the Greek of Theodoret for *in aliis omnibus*, &c. is τα αλλα μεν απαντα συνομολογει τοις προτεροις.

This

Thus then have I ſhewn, that this *introduction* of Epiphanius to his ſubſequent account of the hereſy of the Ebionites, and this *general ſketch* of their tenets, which Dr. P. has miſtranſlated and tortured ſo much, does in reality contain nothing but what is both very intelligible and conſiſtent with itſelf, and with what its author has ſaid elſewhere, as well as with the belief of the Ebionites in the deſcent of a divine Chriſt. For it tends rather to prove, that the Ebionites agreed with the Elceſaites and Nazarenes in *all their other* tenets except the miraculous conception, conſequently in the deſcent of a divine Chriſt; which, we are certain, was held by the Elceſaites in general, and we have no information from Epiphanius or elſewhere that it was diſbelieved by any of the Nazarenes: for as to the *doubt* whether any of the Nazarenes held Jeſus to be the ſon of Joſeph or not; however this may be, it is no impediment to their belief of the deſcent of a divine Chriſt, as we ſee by the example of Cerinthus. Let us therefore now proceed to examine with reſpect to the *particular tenets*, which Epiphanius afterwards aſcribes to the Ebionites, whether the deſcent of a divine Chriſt is not here alſo attributed by him juſt as well to Ebion himſelf and the *firſt* claſs of Ebionites as the *ſecond*: Dr. P. has aſſerted, that this was the belief of only *ſome* of the Ebionites; but we ſhall find it repreſented by Epiphanius as being equally the belief of *all* of them, not excepting their teacher himſelf, agreeably to the words of Tertullian 200 years

before *. I have ſhewn above, that according to Epiphanius the *peculiar* tenet attributed to *Ebion himſelf*, was that of the generation of Jeſus by Joſeph, and not the belief or denial of the deſcent of a divine Chriſt, which *might have been* nevertheleſs common to him and his followers: and that it was ſo, is confirmed by the following paſſages, "At firſt Ebion, as I have ſaid, affirmed Jeſus to be derived from Joſeph: but from ſome certain time afterwards and until this day his followers giving themſelves up to incoherent and perplexed notions, have deviſed among themſelves different opinions concerning Chriſt, ſome one way and ſome another."† Here we ſee that *all the followers* of Ebion, without any diſtinction of them into *firſt* and *ſecond* claſſes, are mentioned as diſſenting from their teacher, although we are left ignorant indeed in regard to the *particular articles* and how far: but as the *time* of the diſſenſion to which he here alludes, was that of Elcſai in the reign of Trajan about the year 98, this was ſo nearly cotemporary with the exiſtence of Ebion himſelf, that we can hence only *preſume* it to be *probable*, that he *might have* ſome diſciples of his own opinion; but Epiphanius has neither *here* nor elſewhere *affirmed* this. As this paſſage then contains *no evidence*, that Ebion *himſelf* did or did not hold

* Sermon on free Enquiry in Religion, p. 87. and *Hiſt. of Opin. Vol.* 3. 206.

† Το μεν πρωτον ὁ Εβιων, ὡς εφην, Χριστον εκ σπερματος ανδρος, τατ' εστι τα Ιωσηφ, ὡριζετο· εκ χρονου δε τινος και δευρο οἱ αυτα, ὡς εις αμηχανον και ασυστατον τρεψαντες τον ιδιον νουν, αλλοι αλλως παρ' αυτοις Χριστα διηγουνται. Hær. 30. Sect. 3.

the

the deſcent of a divine Chriſt, or that it was the belief of only *ſome* of the Ebionites; ſo another paſſage contains *poſitive evidence* that both he and they did hold it. For Epiphanius, after a long epiſode, renews his account of the tenets of Ebion in theſe words, at ſection 13, "Nunc ad inchoatam de Ebione narrationem regredior:"* after this brief introduction he immediately makes a tranſition to Ebion's *followers*, and mentions that St. Matthew's was the Goſpel in uſe *among them* (παρ' αυτοις) hence we may reaſonably conclude, that what is afterwards ſaid in this ſection concerning their tenets, equally reſpects Ebion himſelf as his followers, and juſt as well the firſt claſs as the ſecond; which indeed is a diſtinction, that Epiphanius (as I have obſerved) no where poſitively makes between them, nor indeed any other antient author, but the moderns only: and from this modern practice of dividing them into a *firſt* and *ſecond* claſs many have ſuppoſed, but without any reaſon, that thoſe called the firſt claſs were more antient than the ſecond. Epiphanius goes on in *this ſame* ſection to inform us, that according to the above goſpel in uſe among *Ebion and his followers* it was written "that the Holy Spirit of God deſcended in form of a dove and *entered into* Jeſus at his baptiſm," and a voice from Heaven ſaid, "This is my beloved ſon—I have this day be-

* Επανειμι δε την κατα Εβιωνος ποιημενος ακολουθιαν. We may obſerve, that Petavius in his Latin tranſlation has here again forſaken the Greek, for he renders theſe words *de Ebionitis* inſtead of *de Ebione*.

gotten thee."† Here then the belief of the deſcent of a divine Chriſt is attributed juſt as much to Ebion himſelf (whoſe opinions at the very commencement of this ſection Epiphanius profeſſed to explain) and to the firſt claſs of his followers as to the ſecond; for he ſpeaks indifferently concerning *all of them*, (παρ' αυτοις) and that goſpel which contained thoſe words was equally received by the *Teacher* and *all* his followers. Dr. P. perhaps may here be willing to explain thoſe words, "The Holy Spirit of God deſcended," as meaning nothing more than the communication of a ſpirit of inſpiration to Jeſus; but no where in regard to any of the ſectaries will ſuch a ſenſe be found implied by thoſe words: and they muſt in all reaſon be underſtood here in a manner conſiſtent with the meaning of ſuch words elſewhere, namely, agreably to the current theology of the Jews and ſectaries of that age; who believed that ſuperior and ſuperhuman exiſtent beings often deſcended and reſided in human creatures, as I have ſhewn at large from Philo and the Goſpels. In this ſame manner the Holy Spirit or ſuperangelic Chriſt (which were conſidered by the ſectaries as the ſame) is here ſpoken of as *entering into Jeſus* (εισελθουσης εις αυτον) in order to dwell in him, and hereby a new being or perſon, compounded of humanity and ſuperhumanity is ſaid to be produced or *begotten*,

† [Ιωαννης] ειδε το πνευμα τυ θευ το ἁγιον εν ειδει περιστερας κατελθουσης και εισελθουσης εις αυτον [Ιησουν] και φωνη εγενετο εκ τυ ουρανου, λεγοντος, Συ μου ει ὁ υἱος ὁ αγαπητος—εγω σημερον γεγεννηκα σε. *Sect.* 13.

who

who is ſtyled *the Son of God.* This Gnoſtic tenet and the meaning of the above words, are ſtill more preciſely explained by Epiphanius in the immediately following ſection, where they are confined more ſtrictly to the ſenſe of the deſcent of a ſuper-angelic being to be united with the human Jeſus "Quandoquidem volunt [Ebionæi] Jeſum verè hominem eſſe (ut diximus) & *in eo* Chriſtum *genitum* eſſe, illum videlicet, columbæ ſpecie deſcenſum (quod aliis in ſuper Hærefibus placuiſſe reperio) & conjunctum cum eo [Chriſto] hunc Jeſum, ex ſemine viri & mulieris procreatum, deveniſſe Chriſtum ipſum."* Theſe words then determine clearly, that in the more brief phraſe employed by Epiphanius before, he meant, that a ſuperior being *deſcended and entered into Jeſus*; and here we find the true creed both of Ebion himſelf and of thoſe called the *firſt* claſs of his followers, who held Jeſus to be the ſon of Joſeph: for here we read, that the belief of the deſcent of a divine Chriſt into the merely human Jeſus was held equally by thoſe *who believed Jeſus to be the ſon of Joſeph*, as by the believers in a miraculous conception; it is here expreſsly aſcribed to *all ſuch*, as held Jeſus to have been *ex ſemine viri & mulieris procreatum.* Now that theſe words were not inſerted by Epiphanius inconſiderately and erroneouſly is confirmed by another paſſage ſoon

* Βουλονται τον Ιησουν ουτως ανθρωπον ειναι, ὡς προειπον, Χριστον δε εν αυτω γεγενησθαι τον εν ειδει περιστερας καταβεβηκοτα (καθαπερ ηδη και παρ αλλαις αιρεσεσιν ευρισκομεν) συναφθεντα αυτω και ειναι αυτον [Ιησουν] τον Χριστον, εκ σπερματος ανδρος και γυναικος γεγενημενον. *Sect.* 14.

afterwards, where he repeats to the very ſame purport, " Jeſum *ex virili ſemine* productum affirmant, & electum, & ſic in electione filium Dei appellatum ab illo Chriſto, qui cœlitus in eum [Jeſum] delapſus eſt in forma columbæ."* This paſſage is quoted by Dr. Prieſtley himſelf in his *Hiſt. of Opin. Vol.* 3. 208. and it ſeems truly wonderful, that he could tranſlate the words *ex virili ſemine productum* without recalling his former haſty aſſertion " that it was only *ſome* of the Ebionites, who held the deſcent of a divine Chriſt;" when it is here ſo expreſsly aſcribed by Epiphanius to *all* of them who held *the generation of Jeſus by Joſeph*; and indeed it is aſcribed by his words here more particularly to this claſs than to thoſe, who held the miraculous conception and had been corrupted by the *fanciful notions* of Elcſai. Dr. P. however found himſelf forced by this paſſage tacitly to recall his *former aſſertion* ſo far as *there to allow*, that this was the belief of the Ebionites *in general* (Ibid.) but ſtill with what reluctance does this Lover of Truth ſubmit to the force of Truth, which this paſſage clearly points out to him, and which he alſo *ought* to have pointed out very explicitely to his readers? namely, that it is hence evident, that *all thoſe*, whom he himſelf has every where conſidered as the *original* Ebionites, and who held the mere humanity of Jeſus from Joſeph, held alſo the deſcent

* Ιησουν γεγεννημενον εκ σπερματος ανδρος λεγουσι, και επιλεχθεντα και ουτω κατ' εκλογην υιον θεου κληθεντα, απο του φανωθεν εις αυτον ηκοντος Χριστου εν ειδει περιστερας *Hær.* 30. *Sect.* 16.

of

of a divine Chriſt into him at baptiſm, and were therefore believers in the *pre-exiſtence* and *divinity of the Chriſt*, not mere humaniſts, who conſidered *the Chriſt* only *as a man approved of God by ſigns and wonders, and mighty deeds, which God did by him*, as Dr. P. himſelf deſcribes the creed of himſelf and his followers. (*Ibid. p.* 210). That Ebion himſelf alſo held the ſame opinion, is ſtill farther proved by another paſſage in *Sect.* 29; where Epiphanius addreſſes himſelf to Ebion in the following apoſtrophe, " Neque hoc ſolum (Deceptus Ebion!) de Chriſto probatur, verum etiam anno ætatis 12° ſedens inter ſacerdotes repertus eſt; adeo ut mirarentur in verbo Gratiæ, quod procedebat de ore ejus: non igitur hoc faciebat *anno triceſimo*, ut *dicere poſſis*, ex quo *Spiritus in eum ſanctus ingreſſus eſt, Chriſtum eſſe cæpiſſe*, ſed ab anno duodecimo."* Here we find Epiphanius expreſsly attributing to the *deceived Ebion himſelf* an opinion, " that the Holy Spirit deſcended into Jeſus at thirty years of age, namely, at his baptiſm, and that in conſequence of this *Jeſus became the Chriſt.*" Now theſe words ηλθε το πνευμα εις αυτον muſt in all reaſon be interpreted by the ſenſe, in which Epiphanius uniformly employs ſuch phraſes elſewhere, eſpecially when ſpeaking of the Ebionites; and we have ſeen that in ſeveral *foregoing* quotations they cannot mean any thing

* Και ου μονον τουτο, ω ηπατημενε Εβιων, δεικνυται, αλλα και απο δωδεκαετους ευρισκεται καθημενος ανα μεσον των Ιερεων, και εξεπληττοντο επι τω λογω της χαριτος τω εκπορευομενω εκ τε στοματος αυτου· και ουχι μετα το τριακοστον ετος εποιει τουτο, ινα ειπης, ὁτι αφ' ου ηλθε το πνευμα εις αυτον Χριστος εγενετο, αλλα ευθυς απο δωδεκαετους.

elſe, but that a *ſuper-human if not divine being* deſcended, entered into and reſided in Jeſus. So in like manner near the beginning when ſpeaking of the ſecond claſs of Ebionites, he ſays, " they believed that the Holy Spirit entered into Jeſus, which Holy Spirit is the Chriſt, and that he put on the form or cloathed himſelf with the perſon of him called Jeſus."* Theſe Ebionites therefore muſt have conſidered *the Holy Spirit* in queſtion or *Chriſt* as a really exiſting being; yet the Greek phraſe here is the very ſame as above, Εις αυτον ηλθε το πνευμα: but it can never be reaſonable to underſtand this ſame phraſe in two quite different ſenſes at ſuch a ſmall diſtance from each other, without the leaſt intimation from the author, and while he is giving an account of one and the ſame hereſy of the Ebionites; this would be only to ſqueeze out one's own ſenſe, not to enquire what was the ſenſe of the writer; and no where in Epiphanius will thoſe words be found employed in regard to heretics in any other meaning, than as ſignificant of an *exiſting ſuper-human being*. Now whether Epiphanius underſtood the words employed by the heretics in their right meaning or not, this is foreign from the preſent queſtion; which is only relative to the ſenſe, which Epiphanius himſelf meant to expreſs by ηλθε το πνευμα εις αυτον: and Epiphanius' meaning of them is farther confirmed a few lines afterwards in this very ſection; where he thus again repeats the concluſion from his preceding reaſon-

* Εις αυτον ηλθε το πνευμα, ὁπερ εστιν ὁ Χριστος, και ενεδυσατο αυτον τον Ιησουν καλουμενον. *Sect.* 3.

ing

ing againſt Ebion with a little variation of phraſe, "Quamobrem—non poſt annum 30^m^ cum in eum Species columbæ veniſſet, Filius & Chriſtus appellari cæpit."* In both theſe paſſages it would have been abſurd to have ſuppoſed and put into the mouth of Ebion, (as Epiphanius does by thoſe words *ut dicere poſſis*) to maintain that Jeſus was *not the Chriſt* until after the Holy Spirit deſcended at baptiſm, if Ebion did not maintain the *latter* doctrine at all: but that this really was *his own* doctrine appears again by the words, with which Epiphanius finiſhes his argumentation here; which prove once more, that he conſidered himſelf as having been *here* all along arguing againſt an article of Ebion's *own belief* "Deficiet me tempus ſi ad probandam veritatem & *refellendam* amentiam *Ebionis* & illius ſcholæ abſurdiſſimæ pluribus diſputare voluero." The expreſſions alſo, which Epiphanius has all along employed to deſcribe *the belief* of Ebion and his followers, are the very ſame, which the Gnoſtics commonly employed to denote *the illapſe of the divine Chriſt* at baptiſm; therefore they cannot without diſtortion or mere imagination be ſuppoſed to mean any thing different from the doctrine of Cerinthus and other Gnoſtics concerning the ſame ſubject. I may add moreover, that when Epiphanius mentions any tenet held by *ſome* of Ebion's followers, which was different from thoſe he held himſelf, we are generally, if not

* Ουκ αρα—μετα το τριακοστον ετος, μετα το ελθειν εις αυτον το ειδος της περιστερας, ὑιος και Χριστὸς εκαλειτο. *Sect.* 29.

always,

always, expreſsly informed of this: we have ſeen an inſtance of this before in the note at p. 98; but there Epiphanius does not mention what thoſe *particular* tenets were, in which Ebion differed from his followers; in ſome other places however he does. Thus in *ſect.* 17. he ſays, "Iam *antea* declaravimus quod *hæc* Ebion non profitetur, ſed illius diſcipuli ſolùm, qui poſt tempus aliquod cum Elcſai conjuncti ſunt."† Now what were *theſe* tenets to which he here refers? He had juſt before mentioned what they were, namely, the invocation of Earth, Air and Water, which, as we have ſeen already, was practiſed by the Elceſaites: and he had accordingly *before* informed us, "that the Ebionites had contracted many errors from the time of their having intercourſe with Elcſai."‖ Yet among theſe *innovations* we have no evidence for including that chief tenet of the *deſcent of the divine Chriſt*, but only of ſome *variations* and *additions* to this and other articles: It ſeems improbable then, that Epiphanius would in the abovementioned *apoſtrophe* have addreſſed his reaſoning againſt the deſcent of a ſuper-human Chriſt at baptiſm only, and addreſſed it in ſuch a direct manner to Ebion himſelf, in caſe he had been reaſoning againſt a tenet, which Ebion himſelf had never held.

† Ηδη δε μοι και ανωτερω προδεδηλωται, ὡς ταυτα μεν Εβιων ουκ ηδει, μετα καιρον δε οι συν αυτω συναφθεντες τω Ηλξαι.

‖ Αλλοι αλλως παρ αυτοις Χριστε διηγουνται, ταχα δε ομαι απο τε συναφθηναι αυτοις Ηλξαιον &c.——Πολλη παρ αυτοις σκοτωσις αλλοθι αλλως και αλλως αυτον ὑποληθεμενοις, *Sect.* 3.

Thus

Thus then I have performed what, as Dr. P. ſays, "I had engaged to do," and upon the whole I conclude, that I have not only *ſufficiently* but even *abundantly* proved, that both thoſe Ebionites, commonly called the *firſt* claſs, and alſo the *ſecond* claſs together with Ebion himſelf, in caſe any ſuch perſon ever really exiſted, are uniformly deſcribed by the Fathers, the only hiſtorians on this ſubject exſtant, as being all believers in the divinity or ſuperhumanity of that being, whom *they* conſidered as *the Chriſt*. It is to no purpoſe therefore for Dr. Prieſtley to ſhew, that the ſame Ebionites believed Jeſus to be *a mere man*; for they like the Gnoſtics and Cerinthians did not believe Jeſus to be the Chriſt, until that ſuper-human being was united to him at baptiſm, *after* which and not *before* to this compound they gave the title of *the Son of God*, juſt as the orthodox did to Jeſus at his birth.* But whether in any other reſpects they agreed or diſagreed with the orthodox is foreign from the ſubject; as for inſtance, whether the *union* formed at *baptiſm* was ſuppoſed by the Ebionites to be exactly of the ſame nature or not with that of the orthodox at the *birth* of Chriſt: or again, in regard to the degree of divinity, whether *the Chriſt* of the Ebionites was a ſuperior or only ſubordinate divinity, or no divinity at all, but merely a ſuper-human ſpirit, this is a queſtion of debate merely between the Orthodox and Arians, not between the Orthodox and Humaniſts. Thus

* Χριστον δε ανωθεν ελθοντα εν ειδει περιστερας, και ου τον Ιησουν ειναι Χριστον. Epiph. de Cerintho. Sect. 1.

much

much however is evident, that the Ebionites, like the Gnoſtics, in reducing *Jeſus* to mere humanity, had no view of abaſing (as the Humaniſts ſuppoſe) the dignity or divinity of *the Chriſt*; but quite the contrary, of exalting him (as they conceived) above the ſuppoſed pollutions of *animal body*, by exempting their Chriſt from all connexion with a human birth and the weakneſs of infancy; and by uniting him at laſt to a kind of purified and ſublimated human nature in the perſon of Jeſus, born according to ſome of them by a miraculous conception, and who had alſo as others (the Valentinians, Apellians and perhaps even ſome of the Ebionites) believed, brought his very viſible body with him from Heaven, and his animal ſoul *ex Deo ipſo*.† Such were Dr. Prieſtley's famous unitarian Ebionites and original Jewiſh

† Hence we may learn how much Dr. P. has departed from truth and miſled his readers in his following paſſage: "The Ebionites were *utter ſtrangers* to the principles of that philoſophy of the Gnoſtics, which was the cauſe of the prejudice, that was entertained concerning *matter* and *the body*, and which led the Gnoſtics to recommend corporeal auſterities and abſtinence from marriage. Epiphanius ſays, "that the Ebionites and all ſuch ſects were enemies to virginity and continence." *Hiſt of Opin. Vol.* 3. 205. On the contrary I have proved, that Ebion himſelf held the ſame *principles* and *practices* concerning *body* as the Gnoſtics, and particularly *continence*, as may be ſeen in note at p. 30; Now why did Dr. P. *omit* the latter part of that ſentence and *quote here* only the former part, which relates merely to *later* times, not to the *original* tenets of the Ebionites? See alſo the quotation at p. 70.

Chriſtians,

Chriſtians, who are recommended to us, as having held ſo much more rational and philoſophic doctrines than the Orthodox! whereas in reality they were the mere ſpawn of the Cerinthians and the very dregs of abſurdity and ſuperſtition; juſt as the modern Humaniſts are the humble imitators of the pretendedly philoſophic Gnoſtics in general.§ May not Chriſtianity as well remain as it is, as to be thus reformed? It can never be contended that one part of the Ebionitiſh creed contains original Chriſtianity, and not the other. If ſuch then be the boaſted improvements of philoſophy in religion, Chriſtianity may well ſay to it, *Tute tibi res habeto, egomet curabo meas*: and indeed if all the pretendedly philoſophic opinions of antients and moderns were collected together, they would form the largeſt and richeſt collection of Folly extant; a laſting monument of the raſhneſs, weakneſs and vanity of human reaſon. But whereas ſince the publication of my *Remarks on the Fathers* Dr. Prieſtley has publiſhed his *new Hiſtory* of the early opinions concerning Chriſt, in which he has *at laſt* thought proper to give his readers *ſome account* concerning this ſubject of the belief of the Ebionites in the divinity of the Chriſt, though ſtill on account of *his omiſſions* and *miſinterpretations* a very inac-

§ Agreeably to this Vitringa in another place ſays, "Quin addo, ex ipſo Epiphanio, quantum vis ille de Ebionæis invidioſiſſimè ſcribat, *evidenter* liqueie, Ebionæos idem planè cum Cerinthianis de *duabus* Chriſti Jeſu *naturis* ſenſiſſe." *Obſ. Sacr. lib.* 5. *c.* 5. *ſect.* 8.

curate

curate account; it may be proper to add another ſection, in order to ſet the meaning of thoſe paſſages of Epiphanius, which he *has there produced*, in their proper light, and to ſhew, that they contain nothing inconſiſtent with what has been proved above, or which can form any foundation for objection to the truth of any part of it.

---

*Other paſſages, quoted from Irenæus and Epiphanius by Dr. Prieſtley in his new Hiſtory of early Opinions concerning Chriſt, ſhewn to form no objections to the above account of the belief of all the Ebionites in the deſcent of a divine Chriſt; and the true meaning of thoſe paſſages pointed out.*

DR. P. ſays, that "Irenæus objects to the Gnoſtics, that they were of late date, but he ſays nothing of the Ebionites in that reſpect." *Hiſt. of Opin. Vol.* 3. 163. In proof of this he produces the following paſſage: "Omnes autem *Hi* multo poſterius, mediantibus jam eccleſiæ temporibus, inſurrexerunt." Now to whom does Irenæus refer by *Hi?* Dr. P. ſays, to *the Gnoſtics in general*; but here he departs from the meaning of Irenæus; who in thoſe words oppoſes *one claſs* of Gnoſtics to *another* claſs in regard to their antiquity. By *Hi* he

he means Cerdon, Marcion and Valentinus, whom he had juſt before mentioned, and whom he oppoſes to "*Reliqui*, qui vocantur Gnoſtici a Menandro Simonis diſcipulo, quemadmodum oſtendimus" to this claſs here mentioned, Cerdon, Valentinus and Marcion were, as he ſays, *later* (poſterius) in exiſtence. This then proves nothing as to the *earlier* or *later* origin of the Ebionites. Dr. P. departs from truth again, when he adds, that "Irenæus ſays nothing of the Ebionites in that reſpect:" For I have produced a paſſage at p. 56 and the only one (I believe) in Irenæus, wherein he mentions the *time* of the Ebionites; by which it appears that Irenæus there ſays, they aroſe *later* than Aquila and even than Theodotion, therefore later than the year 120 or 130. There is moreover another paſſage in Irenæus, which ſeems to prove, that he thought thoſe Ebionites commonly now called the ſecond claſs to have been the moſt antient and original ones: "Qui dicuntur Ebionæi—non ſimiliter ut Cerinthus & Carpocrates opinantur," lib. 1. c. 26. This aſſertion, that the original Ebionites did *not* hold the tenet of the generation of Jeſus by Joſeph, like Cerinthus and Carpocrates (for this muſt be the tenet referred to) agrees with his account afterwards that thoſe who *did* hold it were a *later* claſs, who were followers of Aquila, while the original Ebionites held the miraculous conception. I am ſenſible, that inſtead of *non ſimiliter* Grabe and others conjecture, that we ſhould read *conſimiliter*; but this is againſt all the manuſcript authorities; and I think, for the reaſon I have pointed out, againſt the

the truth. I preſume, that Mr. Parkhurſt in his late excellent tract againſt Dr Prieſtley, would not have approved of Grabe's conjecture, if he had attended to theſe conſiderations.†

Dr. P. had aſſerted in his Remarks on my *Diſcourſe*, that only *ſome* of the Ebionites held the divinity of the Chriſt; in proof of this he ſays in his *Hiſt. of Opin.* Epiphanius "obſerves, that afterwards *ſome* of the Ebionites entertained a different opinion concerning Chriſt, than that he was the ſon of Joſeph (*ſuppoſing*) that after Elxæus joined them, they learned of him ſome *Fancy* concerning Chriſt and the Holy Spirit." In ſupport of this Dr. P. produces only the following words, Φαντασιαν τινα περι Χριςϑ διηγεῖσαι και περι πνευμαῖος ἁγιϑ. This may miſlead his readers to ſuppoſe that the *Fancy* (φαντασια) here alluded to was the *deſcent of a Holy Spirit or divine Chriſt at Baptiſm*, and that the Ebionites had learned this *only* of Elcſai. But this is not the meaning of Epiphanius; what the *Fancies* were, to which Epiphanius alludes, he himſelf goes on here to mention, ſuch as "that Adam was the Chriſt, and that he had deſcended often to the Patriarchs before his deſcent into Jeſus;" and elſewhere he mentions others, as "that the Holy Spirit was of a female form, and the ſiſter or concubine of the Chriſt, who was of a male form and 24 ſchæni long and ſix ſchæni broad, &c." So that what Epiphanius *ſuppoſes* here that the Ebionites had learnt of Elcſai, were

† The divinity of Jeſus Chriſt demonſtrated from Scripture by Mr. Parkhurſt, p. 98.

only

only *ſome ſuch fanciful variations* and *additions* to Ebion's *original* doctrine of the deſcent of the Holy Spirit or divine Chriſt at baptiſm, not that they had *firſt introduced* this doctrine itſelf, as Dr. P. inſinuates. I have therefore ſubjoined the Greek words rightly ſtopped and tranſlated, not according to the erroneous manner of Petavius; and this chiefly, becauſe theſe are the very paſſages, to which Waterland likewiſe refers as mentioned in my note at p. 11, in proof that it was only *ſome* of the Ebionites, who held the deſcent of the divine Chriſt: whereas in reality theſe paſſages relate to a very *different article* of belief, and do not *neceſſarily* affirm any thing more, than that *ſome* of the Ebionites had made *various fanciful additions* to Ebion's original doctrine of the divine Chriſt, while *others* ſtill held it *agreeably* to their teacher's *original* and more ſimple plan;* for that

* Το μεν πρωτον ὁ Εβιων Χριστον εκ σπερματος ανδρος, τουτεστι Ιωσηφ, ὡριζετο· εκ χρονου δε τινος και δευρο οι αυτου, ὡς εις ασυμφωνον και αμηχανον τρεψαντες τον ιδιον νουν, αλλοι αλλως παρ αυτοις Χριστου διηγουνται, ταχα δε οιμαι απο του συναφθηναι αυτοις Ηλξαιον (τον ψευδοπροφητην τον παρα τοις Σαμψηνοις και Οσσηνοις και Ελκεσσαιοις καλουμενοις) ὡς εκεινος φαντασιαν τινα περι Χριστου διηγειται και περι πνευματος ἁγιου· τινες γαρ εξ αυτων και Αδαμ τον Χριστον ειναι λεγουσι τον πρωτον πλασθεντα—αλλοι δε εν αυτοις λεγουσι ανωθεν μεν ουτα—ερχεσθαι δε ενταυθα ὁτε βουλεται, ὡς και εν τω Αδαμ ηλθε και τοις Πατριαρχαις εφαινετο—ὁ αυτος επ' εσχατων των ἡμερων ηλθε και αυτο το σωμα του Αδαμ ενεδυσατο και εσταυρωθη—παλιν δε, ὁτε βουλονται λεγουσιν, ουχι, αλλα εις αυτον ηλθε το πνευμα, ὁπερ εστιν ὁ Χριστος, και ενεδυσατο αυτον τον Ιησουν καλουμενον. *Hær.* 30. *Sect.* 29.

"At firſt Ebion affirmed Chriſt [Jeſus] to have been generated by man, namely Joſeph; but from

Ebion himſelf held the deſcent of the divine Chriſt I have already proved *ſufficiently* from the expreſs words of Tertullian, Theodoret and

ſome certain time after until now his diſciples hold different opinions among themſelves concerning Chriſt [Jeſus] and this, I conceive, immediately from the time of their being connected with Elcſai (the falſe prophet among thoſe called the Samſæans, Oſſenes and Elceſaites) juſt as Elcſai himſelf held a certain fanciful notion concerning Chriſt and the Holy Spirit [of their being one male and the other female]: for *ſome* of the Ebionites in like manner [hold fanciful notions, very ſimilar to thoſe of Elcſai and] ſay that Adam the firſt formed man on earth was the Chriſt—while others affirm, that the Chriſt exiſted indeed in Heaven—but that he deſcends from thence when he pleaſes, as accordingly he deſcended into Adam and appeared afterwards to the Patriarchs—and in the laſt days he put on the body of Adam again and appeared a Man to all and was crucified—yet others again maintain, that it was not ſo; but that the ſpirit, which is the Chriſt, deſcended from Heaven into him [Jeſus] and put on the body of that man called Jeſus [who was generated by Joſeph agreeably to the original doctrine of Ebion himſelf]." This paſſage then does no way *neceſſarily* exclude Ebion from holding the deſcent of the divine Chriſt, becauſe it contains a relation, that *ſome* of his followers held *additional* and ſtill more fanciful notions than himſelf concerning this article: theſe more fanciful and *particular* notions of *ſome* are here only oppoſed to Ebion's own more ſimple and the *general* belief among his diſciples, not to his ignorance of or denial of any ſuch doctrine at all; they are therefore perfectly conſiſtent with what follows afterwards, where, as I have ſhewn, Epiphanius aſcribes to Ebion himſelf and his *original* diſciples a belief, that the πνευμα αγιον ηλθε εις αυτον Ιησουν at his baptiſm. Whereas Waterland and

Dr. P.

Epiphanius himſelf. As the paſſages therefore here referred to by Waterland and Dr. P. do not *neceſſarily* demand a conſtruction and ſenſe inconſiſtent with what has been proved from the Fathers abovementioned, it would be preposterous to deduce from ſuch vague and ambiguous expreſſions, that it was from Elcſai *only* that the Ebionites borrowed the belief of the deſcent of the divine Chriſt and not from Ebion; while this fact is ſo expreſsly contradicted by the above *three* Fathers. What Epiphanius here alledges to have been borrowed from Elcſai ſeems to be ſufficiently indicated by his word φαντασια, i. e. *fanciful viſions* which Elcſai had *added* to the original doctrine of Ebion, ſuch as that *Adam was the Chriſt, &c.* with which viſions *ſome* of the Ebionites had been corrupted, while *others* had retained Ebion's original and more ſimple doctrine of *the deſcent of a divine Chriſt at baptiſm into the human Jeſus born of Joſeph.*§ Such then ſeems to

Dr. P. fixing on the word *ſome* (τινες) without attending to the whole paſſage, haſtily ſuppoſe, that Epiphanius had here aſſerted, that *ſome* only of the Ebionites held the divinity of Chriſt and *others* did not: when in reality he only aſſerts, that *ſome* held *one* opinion concerning the mode of the Chriſt's divinity and *ſome* a *different* opinion, while all held his ſuper-humanity in *ſome mode* or other; not excepting even thoſe who held Adam to have been Chriſt, for how was Adam, if a mere man, able to appear again?

§ What the nature of thoſe fanciful notions of Elcſai were, which Epiphanius calls φανλασιαι will appear from the following paſſages, where he again calls them by the ſame name φανλασιαι. "Ebionitæ acceperunt ab Elcſai *ſomnium* illud (την φανλασιαν) Chriſtum

be the meaning of Epiphanius in theſe paſſages; more of which alſo Dr. P. has quoted at p. 206, and with the ſame view of proving what they do not prove, that it was *ſome* only of the Ebionites, who held the Gnoſtic doctrine of a preexiſtent divine Chriſt deſcending into Jeſus at baptiſm; for this doctrine appears to have been *common* to them all after ſome mode or other.

Here moreover I may obſerve, that the words, which I produced at p. 87 from the Nazarene goſpel, retain evident marks of being derived from theſe *viſions* of Elcſai: for there Jeſus ſpeaks of the *Holy Spirit* as being his *Mother*; and agreeably to this we have ſeen, that Elcſai conſidered the Holy Spirit as being a female, and as being the *Soror*, meaning perhaps the concubine of the Chriſt *above*, whence iſſued the Chriſt *below*. This was nearly the doctrine of the Valentinian Gnoſtics afterwards, and more or leſs of the older Gnoſtics likewiſe; by which we learn both how deeply the Nazarenes had drunk from the corrupted ſtreams of Elcſai,

eſſe in formâ ſimilem viro, longitudine ſchænorum quatuor & viginti, latitudine ſchænorum ſex; prope ipſum vero ſtare ſpiritum ſanctum figura muliebri ſed inviſibilem." (*De Ebion. ſect.* 17.) "Chriſtum creaturam putant Elceſaitæ & frequenter olim apparuiſſe & Adami corpus induiſſe, cum ei viſum eſt; hujus *Sororem* eſſe ſpiritum ſanctum, muliebri figurâ, Chriſtum que ac etiam ſpiritum ſanctum conſtare latitudine quatuor & viginta (*viz. ſchænorum*) & multas alias nugas." *De Elcſaitis Hær.* 53. *ſect.* 1. It was only to ſuch opinions as theſe, that Epiphanius gives the name of φαντασιαι, and not *in general* to the deſcent of the Chriſt at baptiſm; and the tenet about Adam was held by Elcſai alſo, as we here ſee.

and

and the Ebionites alſo from thoſe of the Gnoſtics in general; unleſs perhaps we ought rather to ſay, that the Ebionites were themſelves the originals: for that chriſtian Gnoſticiſm aroſe from among the Samaritan and Jewiſh ſectaries I have ſhewn ſeveral traces of before, and I now find, that Vitringa accedes to this opinion; he ſays "Ex Irenæo liquet Gnoſticæ Theologiæ auctores fuiſſe Judæos."* Why then does Dr. P. arbitrarily pronounce it to be a highly improbable allegation in Epiphanius, becauſe he has charged the Ebionites (who were rather Samaritan ſectaries and Chriſtians, than Jewiſh ones) "with the peculiar doctrine of the Gnoſtics?" Valentinus like Elcſai ſpeaks of *the Savior below* as being deſcended from *materna Sapientia cœlitùs* (απο της Μητρικης Σοφιας ανωθεν): Simon alſo had long before ſpoken of the Πνευμα ἅγιον or Εννοια (Intelligentia) as the *Scortum* of the Chriſt. *Epiph. Hær.* 20. *Sect.* 2. But we may find the original archetype of ſuch opinions or modes of expreſſion at leaſt, in the popular theology of the Jews themſelves before Chriſtianity or chriſtian Gnoſticiſm exiſted; for Philo had, even before theſe Gnoſtics, ſpoken of the *divine Logos and Son* as having *God the Father of all for his Father, and Wiſdom for his Mother* [πατηρ μεν Θεου, Μητηρ δε Σοφιας. See Crit. Obſ. Vol. 4. p. 47.] Gnoſticiſm therefore ſeems to have had a more antient and intimate connexion with Jewiſh theology, than Dr. P. conceives: he need not then wonder to find traces of it among the Elceſaites, Ebionites, Oſſenes and

* *Obſer. Sacr. lib.* 1. *c.* 2. *ſect.* 2.

Nazirites (and through them among the Nazarenes) for all thoſe were originally Samaritan and Jewiſh ſectaries, who had embraced Chriſtianity; and had thus intermixed their more antient philoſophic nonſenſe with the vulgar ſimplicity of chriſtian orthodoxy. Superſtitions of as abſurd a kind frequently ariſe from the conceits and pretended knowledge of philoſophy as from the real ignorance of the multitude; hence quackery, more or leſs, is to be found in almoſt every ſcience, otherwiſe the nonſenſe of the learned profeſſor would not be happily ſuited to the nonſenſe of his audience.

Another quotation, which Dr. P. produces from Epiphanius, does however induce him to depart from his preceeding aſſertion, that it was *only ſome* of the Ebionites, who attributed preexiſtence and ſuper-humanity to the Chriſt; for he afterwards allows "that Epiphanius, ſpeaking of the Ebionites *in general*," aſcribes theſe tenets to them: yet even here Dr. P. ſtill adopts that practice of *omitting*; for when he thus immediately after tranſlates theſe words of Epiphanius, "They ſay, that *Jeſus was born of the ſeed of man* and became the Son of God by adoption, by *Chriſt coming into him from above* in the form of a dove,"* why did he *omit* here to inform his readers, that theſe words prove *all* the Ebionites to have held the deſcent of the divine Chriſt; that is, *all thoſe firſt and original* Ebionites (if indeed they were ſo) who held Jeſus to be the Son of Joſeph, juſt as well as the ſecond

* See the Greek in note at p. 102 above: and *Hiſt. of Opin. Vol. 3. p.* 208.

claſs

claſs who had been initiated into the fanciful viſions of Elcſai.

Dr. P. proceeds alſo there to quote one other paſſage, wherein he ſays, "that Epiphanius aſcribes theſe [the above] doctrines, not to Ebion himſelf, but *to his followers*. Here then at laſt Dr. P. allows that *all* the followers of Ebion held the divinity of *the Chriſt*, Ebion himſelf only excepted. The words of Epiphanius, which he quotes as teſtifiying this are theſe: "Ebion himſelf held that Chriſt was a mere man, *born* as other men are; but *they who from him* are called Ebionites, ſay, that God had a ſuperior power called his Son, that he aſſumed the form of Adam and put it off again."* But here again why did Dr. P. *omit* to inform his readers, that *his immediately preceeding* quotation to this proves, that Ebion's holding Jeſus to be mere man the ſon of Joſeph, does no way imply, that he himſelf did *not* alſo believe, like the reſt of the Ebionites, *his becoming the Son of God by Chriſt coming into him from above*: now concerning this laſt tenet there is no mention made in *this* quotation, either with reſpect to *Ebion himſelf* or *his followers*, but merely in regard to a *different* queſtion, namely, the *mere humanity* or *ſuper-humanity* of Jeſus at *his birth*, not of the Chriſt at his *baptiſm*. It was therefore to this very paſſage, which I referred in my *diſcourſe* in the note at p. 17. as rendering

* Ηδη δε μοι ειρηται, ως διαφορως εκαστος αυτων περι Χριστου υπερβαλλει· τοτε μεν ο αυτος Εβιων λεγων εκ παρατριβης ψιλον ανθρωπον αυτον γεγενησθαι· αλλοτε οι απ' αυτε Εβιωναιοι ανω Δυναμιν εκ θεε κεκλησθαι υιον, και ηδιον καλα καιρον τον Αδαμ ενδυεσθαι τε και εκδυεσθαι.

it doubtful, whether the ſecond claſs of Ebionites, beſides believing a miraculous conception, did not in conſequence of this believe moreover that *Jeſus* was ſuper-human *at his birth*, (juſt like the Carpocratian, Valentinian and Apellian Gnoſtics) and that he had brought his *ſoul* at leaſt, if not his *body* alſo along with him from Heaven at the miraculous conception of Mary, having paſſed through her, like water through a pipe, without deriving his body from her, or being contaminated with her mere humanity: And certainly Theodoret, as we have ſeen, ſays that the Elceſaites (who were the ſame nearly as the Ebionites) held, that not only *the Chriſt*, but *Jeſus* alſo was *ex Deo*. We may wiſh, that the Fathers had been more preciſe in their expreſſions; but their neglectful contempt of ſuch philoſophic *Fancies* ought not to be made a foundation for Dr. Prieſtley's aſcribing to theſe ſectaries opinions diametrically oppoſite to their real ones. Thoſe, who deſire to form a clear idea of the fanciful viſions of the ſectaries, muſt not thus confound together two articles totally diſtinct; for they ſeem to have *all* (except perhaps Carpocrates) believed, that Jeſus became the Son of God *at Baptiſm* by the divine Chriſt *coming into him*: but they differed in regard *to his birth*; for while Ebion and Cerinthus made him to be *then* merely human, others, fearful leſt the divine Chriſt ſhould be debaſed by an union with the pollutions of *animal body*, ſuppoſed that Jeſus was ſuper-human even *at his birth* in conſequence of a miraculous conception. So that this paſſage in reality proves nothing againſt

againſt Ebion's *own* belief of the divinity of *the Chriſt at his deſcent*, but only of the ſuper-humanity of Jeſus *at his birth*. However, even if it did prove that point againſt Ebion himſelf, while *all his followers* held a different doctrine, what conſequence can be deduced from this? nothing more, than there was a *ſingle* inſtance of *one perſon*, Ebion, who diſbelieved the divinity of the Chriſt, during the firſt two centuries; this can never prove Humaniſm to have been original Chriſtianity: and even in regard to this *ſingle perſon* Dr. P. himſelf denies, that any ſuch perſon ever exiſted. Nay if we could *preſume* moreover (which is however mere preſumption) that Ebion had *ſome followers* of his own opinion *before* the riſe of the ſecond claſs of Ebionites; ſtill they will appear according to the deſcription of Virgil, as being only *Rari quidem nantes in gurgite vaſto*: therefore they can prove nothing in favor of, but rather againſt the *univerſality* of Humaniſm. Still farther, Dr. P. has *omitted* another circumſtance in regard to the above paſſage, which would have helped to determine its meaning, which is, that it is a part of the very laſt period in Epiphanius' account of the Ebionites; and is alſo expreſsly introduced by a *preface*, which ſhews, that it is merely a *ſummary and brief recapitulation* of what Epiphanius had deliverd *before* in a more diffuſe manner; therefore it cannot poſſibly be ſuppoſed to mean any thing *different* from what had been delivered before, but only to expreſs the *ſame ſenſe* in a more brief and conſequently a *leſs explicite* manner. His introductory words are " Cæterum hoc a nobis *antea* commemoratum

tum eſt, qui ex illa ſectâ ſunt, unum quemque eorum variè de Chriſto [Jeſu] ſentire; olim enim Ebion ipſe dicens &c." and beſides *omitting* what is ſo uſeful to determine the meaning of the above *three* only quotations, which Dr. P. does *now at laſt* produce from Epiphanius concerning the belief of the Ebionites in the divinity of the Chriſt, why has he *overlooked* alſo all thoſe other *more perſpicuous* paſſages adduced by me above in proof of the ſame article? It is to no purpoſe at all to refer to the teſtimony of the Fathers, if we do not endeavor to comprehend what they ſay; and it can never be for any good purpoſe, if reference be made only to the more obſcure paſſages, while all the *more perſpicuous* ones are *omitted*. Such a conduct tends only to introduce confuſion; this however may be more acceptable than perſpicuity to thoſe, whoſe beſt evidence for their aſſertions is, "Let the darkneſs cover us." Nevertheleſs even Dr. P's own quotations referred to *by himſelf* do not prove what he concludes from them, "that Epiphanius has either miſrepreſented or confounded the doctrines of the Ebionites and Cerinthians," for on the contrary they are, as I have ſhewn, perfectly reconcileable both with Epiphanius's words elſewhere, and with the aſſertions of all other antient Fathers, and with Ebion's own belief in the *deſcent of a divine Chriſt*.

As to the *laſt* pretended miſrepreſentation made by Epiphanius (as Dr. P. alledges) in his ſaying "that the Ebionites rejected ſacrifices," when on the contrary they are ſaid by others "to have inſiſted on the obſervance of the Jewiſh

Jewiſh law;" I have ſhewn above, that rejection of ſacrifices was one *neceſſary* part of the ſyſtem of *abominating animal body and dead bodies* adopted by the Ebionites &c from the Samaritans. Now as ſome of theſe ſects were zealous for the Jewiſh Law, *as obſerved by their anceſtors*, notwithſtanding that they rejected the Pentateuch; it will be eaſily conceived, that they might as well reject ſacrifices, though they retained a reſpect for the other inſtitutions derived down from antiquity among them: for if they could reject the Pentateuch, becauſe they believed it to be a compilation made in later times than Moſes, why might they not juſt as well reject Sacrifices, as being a later inſtitution. Upon the whole then it appears evident, that ſo far were the Ebionites of either claſs, together with the Nazarenes, Elceſaites and other *ſectaries* of that early age from giving into the doctrine of the *mere Humanity* of the Chriſt; that in reality there was nothing, which they *abominated* ſo much, as that the dignity of *their* Chriſt ſhould be debaſed and defiled by any union whatever with *mere humanity*, which they conſidered as being in a moſt *abominable* ſtate of pollution; for which reaſon they invented a variety of conjectural ſyſtems to emancipate their divine or ſuper-human Chriſt from ſuch an ignominious ſtate: that claſs of Gnoſtics indeed, who maintained Chriſt to have been a mere *Phantaſm* in the form of man, went the moſt effectually to work; while the other ſects contented themſelves more or leſs, with refining and purifying the humanity of *Jeſus* by means of a miraculous conception and a ſuppoſed heavenly extraction,

traction, and alſo with delaying his union to *the Chriſt*, until after the imbecility of infancy, when he had commenced the office of Meſſiah in the maturity of life and reaſon at his baptiſm; by which laſt ceremony Jeſus was conſidered as purged ſtill more from the pollutions of humanity. Hence it follows, that Dr. Prieſtley's ſuppoſition of the *univerſality* of the doctrine of Humaniſm among thoſe ſectaries is a mere romance, built upon error and a total perverſion of their moſt favorite principles: in order to ſupport which, only ſuch paſſages of the Fathers have been produced by Dr. P. as notice the belief of ſome ſectaries in the humanity of Jeſus; without his readers being informed, that all thoſe ſectaries who held that opinion, did not conſider Jeſus as being himſelf *the Chriſt*, but only as being a human creature, whoſe perſon *the Chriſt* aſſumed and figured in during his miniſtry. So that Dr. P. has told his readers only *one half* of the tenets of the Ebionites, and concealed or *omitted* the other half.

Having thus ſhewn, that the *account*, which ſince the publication of my *Diſcourſe*, Dr. Prieſtley has given in his *Hiſtory of early Opinions* concerning the belief of the Ebionites in the divinity and pre-exiſtence of the Chriſt, contains no evidence againſt the reality of their belief in theſe tenets, as aſſerted by me, but rather much in favor of it; I have now in courſe finiſhed my propoſed ſubject, of proving that no ſuch thing, as the *doctrine of Humaniſm*, was to be found among the *ſectaries* of the firſt two centuries: for Dr. Prieſtley himſelf maintains, that the Nazarenes were the ſame ſectaries as

the

the Ebionites; therefore what I have proved of the one, muſt be equally true concerning the other; there was however a difference between them originally and perhaps to the very laſt, yet not enough to be of any moment in our enquiry. Beſides theſe two, there were no other antient ſects, to whom Humaniſm can be imputed in the firſt two centuries; for Artemon, as I have ſhewn, did not live until after the year 200; Theodotus indeed flouriſhed about the year 195; yet ſtill this was ſo late in the ſecond century, as can give no pretenſions to Humaniſm having been *original Chriſtianity:* beſides we know very little concerning his tenets, and ſo far as they have been preſerved, he will be found to have been a mere ſcholar of the Ebionites, who *firſt taught* among the Greek chriſtians thoſe Ebionitiſh opinions, which were until then hid in obſcurity and neglected through their reſidence near the great deſarts, and the ignorance of the Greek chriſtians in their Syriac language; excepting ſo far as Juſtin Martyr had made their tenets known in his Hiſtory of Hereſies. From this tract Irenæus in Gaul, and Tertullian in Africa doubtleſs borrowed all they knew of the Ebionites, and probably alſo Origen in Egypt: but the Gnoſtics had public ſchools in Greece, Aſia, Egypt and Italy; hence the reaſon they became ſo obnoxious to the firſt chriſtians, while obſcurity of reſidence and language better preſerved the Ebionites from orthodox jealouſy, indignation and enquiries. Epiphanius and perhaps Theodoret alſo are the only Fathers, who ſeem to have known the Ebionites perſonally; accord-

accordingly from them we obtain more minute and certain information concerning their principles; yet the latter even of these confesses his being indebted to Justin Martyr's information, and probably Epiphanius drew largely from the same source likewise.

In the above enquiry I have likewise intermixed *a refutation* of the *chief part* of such of Dr. Priestley's *remarks* concerning me, as related to the present subject: I intended also to have added here at the end a *refutation* of all his others, which are more relative to *words* than *things*; but I have found this enquiry run out into greater length, than I at first apprehended; and I have included it in an *Appendix*, in order that I might neither delay it, nor yet make it to interfere with the course of my *Remarks on the Fathers.*

I have proposed moreover in my title page and afterwards, to annex a proof or two, that not even among *the orthodox* any more than among *the sectaries* has any evidence been produced by Dr. Priestley, that the doctrine of Humanism had ever been known during the first two centuries either among the *common people* or their *teachers*; in case the words of those authors, whom he quotes, had been represented by him agreeably to the real meaning of the writers. But this I must also now postpone; and I shall only observe concerning this question, that Dr. Priestley suggests in his *History of Christian Opinions Vol.* 1. in proof of the christian philosophers about the time of Justin having first expelled Humanism and introduced the doctrine of Christ's divinity, that they had bor-

borrowed their notions of the Trinity from the *later Platoniſts*, as they are commonly called. Now Plotinus was the oldeſt of theſe later Platoniſts, and he was not born until after the year 200; how then could Juſtin about the year 140 borrow any thing from theſe later Platoniſts? Yet not ſatisfied with ſuggeſting this monſtrous anachroniſm both by his *arrangement* and *expreſſions* in the body of his *new Hiſtory* in ſuch a manner, as muſt neceſſarily lead his readers into an error concerning the *poſſibility* of this fact;† Dr. P. has taken care moreover to confirm them in this error in his *Biographical Chart* prefixed to his firſt volume: for behold, there Plotinus is placed as being born ſoon after the year 100, and a little *before* Juſtin Martyr, ſo as to make him old enough to teach the Platonic catechiſm to Juſtin; whereas in reality Juſtin was long dead before the *birth* of Plotinus, who did not flouriſh until about the year 240; therefore a whole century later than where Dr. Prieſtley has placed him in his *chart*.* What

† "Thoſe who are uſually called the *later Platoniſts*, were thoſe Philoſophers chiefly of Alexandria, who a little *before* and *after* the commencement of the chriſtian æra adopted the general principles of Plato, but not without incorporating with them thoſe of other Philoſophers, ſo that theirs was not abſolutely pure and unmixed Platoniſm," *p.* 356.

* "Ammonius Philoſophiam Alexandriæ profitetur, anno Chriſti 232, cujus auditor annis 11 fuit Plotinus—Porphyrius Plotinum 59 annum agentem ſecutus eſt ann. Chr. 264—Plotinus obiit anno 270." *Petavius Doctrin. Temp. Vol.* 2. *p.* 698. 704. 705.

"Plotinus came to Rome in 245—he died in 270 aged 66 years." *Collier's Dictionary.*

depen-

dependance then can be placed on the expoſitions of ſcripture or the aſſertions in hiſtory by thoſe, who can thus make dead chriſtians to be inſtructed by prophane philoſophers who were not born until 20 or 30 years after the death of their pretended ſcholars?

But the real fact is, that theſe *later Platoniſts* were ſcholars and imitators of the chriſtian Fathers, not contrariwiſe, as has been proved by Baltus, Dr. Randolph and others: hence aroſe whatever reſemblance may be found in their principles to the chriſtian doctrine of the Trinity; and this Dr. P. himſelf allows to be very little, but that in Plato himſelf the reſemblance is ſtill leſs.

---

☞ *At p.* 116 *add the following note.*

"Qui legerit Canticum Canticorum, & *Sponſum Animæ* dei *Sermonem* intellexerit, crediderit que Evangelio, quod ſecundum Hebræos editum nuper tranſtulimus, in quo ſub perſonâ Salvatoris dicitur, *Modo me tulit mater mea, Sanctus Spiritus, in uno Capillorum meorum*, non dubitabit dicere *Sermonem Dei* ortum eſſe de Spiritu, & *Animam*, quæ *Sponſa Sermonis* eſt, habere ſocium *Sanctum Spiritum* quæ apud Hebræos genere dicitur feminino." *Comm. Mich.* 7. 6. Here Jerom indicates the true ſource of this corruption in the Nazarene goſpel, viz. that it was a doctrine deduced from Jewiſh theology; while Origen outrages the ſpirit of allegorizing by attempting to reconcile this paſſage to orthodoxy. *V. Comm. Joh. Sect.* 2.

FINIS.

*ERRATA.*

Page 35, In note, for 22. 3. *read* 22. 31.
37, *For* ſupported *read* ſuppoſed.

# ILLUSTRATIONS

OF

# VARIOUS SUBJECTS IN THE PRECEDING FOUR VOLUMES.

Supereſt, ut illuſtrata veritas pateat, multique ab errore liberentur. LACTANT. 4. 5.

INSTEAD of the preſent faſhionable mode of forming *Encyclopædias*, and collecting all branches of human knowledge into complete ſyſtems, I have repeatedly urged the propriety of proceeding more in the anylitical method of communicating truths, by firſt of all ſeparating, minutely examining, and coming to ſolid concluſions concerning the *particular* and ſubordinate articles, out of which thoſe *general* ſyſtems are formed, and on which they reſt as their foundation; which, however, are too often formed by a combination of ſuch incongruous materials, as to produce inconſiſtencies impoſſible to be removed, and conſequently to increaſe confuſion, doubts and darkneſs, inſtead of leading us into the regions of clear light and well-founded knowledge. I have occaſionally mentioned likewiſe the impoſſibility of ſufficiently diſcuſſing any ſubject under conſideration otherwiſe than by piece-meal, if we wiſh to ſift it to the bottom, and not by a ſuperficial ſurvey, leave it under as much uncertainty as at firſt;

becauſe in a chain of reaſoning, there is often a neceſſity of taking many things as well known and certain truths, before we can give adequate proofs of ſome others in view; and yet it often happens, that thoſe ſuppoſed well-known truths themſelves are in reality very doubtful, or at leaſt require to be cleared from various difficulties, in which they have been involved by the errors and miſrepreſentations of different authors. Theſe *illuſtrations* therefore are intended to elucidate ſome of thoſe ſubordinate ſubjects in all the four volumes, which may be conſidered as under-parts in our foregoing inquiries; and concerning which ſome inaccuracies may have been admitted, or ſome doubts left ſubſiſting, either by myſelf or others, which may form obſtacles to the clear conviction of readers, but which nevertheleſs may in themſelves be capable of being removed, although it was not convenient to be done before, on account of the interruption it would have cauſed to the courſe of our preceding reaſoning.* This *Supplement* is alſo neceſſary on another account; for having been prevented through various cauſes from completing the plan, which I had propoſed at vol. iv. p. 11, it may nevertheleſs be acceptable, that I ſhould introduce by means of theſe *Illuſtrations*, any portions of that original plan, which it may be ſtill convenient for me to put together, notwithſtanding that they may not be

* It will however not be convenient to inſert the ſeveral articles in the ſame order, that they have occurred in thoſe volumes: but at the end of them a catalogue ſhall be added, with a reference to the pages in which they occur in theſe

now

now connected exactly in the manner at first propoſed, nor yet extended ſo far as I at firſt intended. Hereby former miſtakes may be corrected, obſcurities cleared up, objections obviated, additional proofs ſupplied, and concluſions rendered ſtill more convincing.

Vol. iv. p. 166. [*There is poſitive evidence of Claudius having been adopted.*] Since writing this I have perceived, that of two proofs, which I there produced for the adoption of Claudius, the firſt is totally foreign from the queſtion, and proves nothing: alſo, that the ſecond is of a very doubtful kind. As to the *firſt*, it is juſt as I there ſuſpected, that an error has been made in the Latin tranſlation of the paſſage referred to in Dio; for it has omitted repeating the name *Tiberius* in the ſecond part of the ſentence, although it is in the Greek text, as I now find: the tranſlator plainly ſuppoſed, that the ſame perſon was meant in both places, which is a miſtake; for they were two different perſons, yet preciſely of the ſame names. The firſt was *Tiberius Claudius Nero*, younger brother of Germanicus Cæſar, who were the ſons of Druſus, the younger ſon of Livia, wife to Auguſtus; this Tiberius was afterwards the emperor *Claudius*. But the Tiberius mentioned in the ſecond ſentence was his uncle *Tiberius Claudius Nero*, elder brother of the above Druſus, and afterwards the emperor *Tiberius*. Dio himſelf is not quite excuſable for making ſo little diſtinction between two different perſons of exactly the ſame name, which miſled the Latin tranſlator, and hereby myſelf: it is however true,

that he had always mentioned him as here by the name of *Tiberius*, without any addition to it. It was therefore this laſt mentioned Tiberius, to whom the words *adminiſtratione belli* refer, and not to Germanicus, as I before ſuppoſed. This quotation then proves only the adoption of the emperor Tiberius, and not of Claudius: conſequently, that whole paſſage ought to be expunged from the words quoted above, as far as to *at hand to conſult*, in p. 167.*

The ſecond of my proofs referred to above for the adoption of Claudius, was taken from a coin produced by Panvinius, under the article of Caligula, which on the reverſe has the legend as before recited; but this legend Panvinius himſelf does not explain. Therefore as no other perſon of the name of Germanicus was alive in the reign of Caligula except Claudius, I preſumed, that he was the perſon there meant and called Cæſar. But I have ſince found reaſon to doubt this concluſion; for *Zacharia* in his *Inſtitutione Numiſmatica*, *Roma* 1772, *p.* 419, aſcribes coins with legends preciſely the ſame as in this caſe, to Germanicus the elder brother of Claudius; who being dead before the reign of Caligula, it is to be conſidered, whether or not the names of deceaſed perſons are ever thus found inſcribed on coins: it ſeems poſſible however, as an extraordinary caſe, that Caligula might cauſe the name of his father Germanicus to be inſcribed on his own coins, for the ſame

* In the Latin quotation, at p. 167, the omitted name *Tiberius* ſhould be inſerted before *in dedicatione*.

reaſon

reaſon that Claudius was ſo fond of putting *Druſi filius* on thoſe during his ſubſequent reign, namely, in order to ingratiate themſelves with the military. This is alſo the more probable in the preſent caſe, becauſe Germanicus is there ſtyled *Tiberii filius*, which was the real fact, he being adopted by Tiberius;* whereas Claudius ſeems to have been held in too much contempt by Tiberius to be adopted by him: and that Claudius was not adopted, ſeems in ſome degree confirmed by the very paſſage of Dio, referred to above, where he gives to Germanicus the name of Cæſar, but to Claudius that of Nero.

However, after all was it any way neceſſary, that Claudius ſhould have been adopted in order to be intitled to the name of Cæſar? He ſeems to have been intitled to that name by hereditary right, becauſe his father Druſus had been adopted into the Julian family by Tiberius, and ſons were intitled to the rights of their parents. So that when Suetonius relates, that upon the adoption of his elder brother Germanicus by Tiberius, Claudius took up the name of Germanicus, this does not prove that he was not then intitled to the name of Cæſar; for he might have preferred the name of Germanicus through pique or ſome other motive. The adoption alſo of Germanicus might not have been made by Tiberius, in order to admit him into the Julian family, to which he ſeems to have been intitled

* At p. 164, I have erroneouſly ſaid, that he was adopted by Auguſtus, it was only in the life-time of Auguſtus, and by his deſire that he was adopted by Tiberius.

before

before by the adoption of his father; but in order to give to his *nephew* the rights of a *ſon*, and thereby intitle him to the throne, even in preference to the ſon himſelf of Tiberius, then ſtill alive; who was no way by blood related to Auguſtus, as Germanicus was, by his being the ſon of Druſus, the ſuppoſed ſon of Auguſtus, though born only three months after the marriage of his mother Livia with Auguſtus. If this was the true ſtate of the caſe, Claudius might with juſt as much propriety be ſtyled Cæſar by Philo, before he became emperor, as Claudius aſſume the name afterwards without any adoption: for although Claudius himſelf might have preferred the name of Germanicus, yet this would not prevent Philo or others from giving him the name of Cæſar, which belonged to him, in order to point out more clearly to his readers whom he meant. Dio indeed mentions, that Claudius on his acceſſion accepted all the honors which the ſenate decreed to him, but it is not ſaid, that the title of Cæſar was one of them:* and that he was intitled to it by hereditary right, appears from a ſimilar caſe in regard to Britannicus, the ſon of Claudius himſelf. For he is ſtyled *Britannicus Cæſar* on coins, although he never became emperor, to which name therefore he muſt have been intitled as the *ſon* of a Cæſar: why then ſhould not Claudius likewiſe have received the ſame appellation from Philo *before* he became emperor,

* "Decretos ſibi honores ſtatim accepit [Claudius] nomine tantum Patris Patriæ dilato." *Ap. Claudium.*

as

as Britannicus did on coins under ſimilar circumſtances, except that the father of Claudius was never emperor.*

Upon the whole therefore, theſe corrections do no way invalidate my former reaſoning, in which I contended, that Mr. Whitaker had no right to conclude from the title of Cæſar, given to Claudius by Philo, that he was already become emperor before the compoſition of that tract of Philo againſt Caligula. Neither is another fact there mentioned of any ſufficient force, namely, that one of thoſe enemies of Flaccus is ſaid there to have been afterwards ſlain by Claudius Cæſar; for as Suetonius relates, that he lived in the country as a mere knight, amidſt drunkenneſs and debauchery, it is poſſible, that the perſon in queſtion might have been killed by Claudius in ſome drunken fit and private quarrel; there being no intimation of his being ſlain by imperial authority, in caſe the appellation of Cæſar be not ſufficient.

Vol. iv. p. 177. [*Annotat. lin. ult.*] It may be acceptable to add ſome farther evidence on this ſubject, than what I could before well include in a note. We ought to guard againſt the too great ſubtlety of criticiſm, which has often pretended to diſcover imitations in authors from ſome others, when in reality they all copied directly from nature, or from ſome other common original, which ſubſiſted the ſame in different and diſtant ages; and ſuch is appa-

* Inſtitutione Numiſmatica. P. 420.

rently

rently the caſe here, the three authors in queſtion having all of them only adopted *ideas* and *phraſes* more or leſs in current uſe at that time in Jewiſh theology. For inſtance, the Hebrew word *chabud* in the Pentateuch is in the ſeptuagint Greek generally expreſſed by δοξα θεου, but it might juſt as well, and probably was by other Jews expreſſed by αυγασμα θεου, i. e. *a luminous glory*, or *ſplendor*, like *a fiery cloud*. It was by the appearance of this *glory*, that the *divine preſence* was thought to be manifeſted. Hence the Chaldee paraphraſes of the Pentateuch often explain the meaning of that phraſe by the addition of the word *ſchechina*, by which is meant the *divine habitation*, or *preſence*, as if the Deity had taken up his habitation wherever this *luminous glory* appeared. Thus, in Exod. xl. 35 and 38, where the Greek has δοξα κυριου, *gloria domini*, *nubes* and *ignis*, the Jeruſalem paraphraſe ſubſtitutes "Nubes gloriæ *ſchechinæ*, [i. e. præſentiæ] domini et ignis lucebant." The paraphraſes of the Pentateuch by Onkelos and Jonathan repeatedly make uſe of the ſame word *ſchechina* in the ſame manner. But ſome times they add *ſchechina* to *ſpiritus domini*, or *logos domini*. Thus in Gen. i. 2, the Jeruſalem paraphraſe has "*Spiritus* miſericordiæ *a præſentia domini* in aquas ſpirabat—et creavit *logos domini* hominem in ſimilitudine ſua." But when the creation is in that paraphraſe mentioned again at Exod. xii. 42, it changes the expreſſion thus: "Quando revelatus fuit *logos domini* de mundo ut crearetur,—logos domini *lucidus fuit* et *lucem* produxit." Here *logos domini* ſeems to have

have been uſed as if it were ſynonimous to *gloria domini*. Again, at Numb. xxiii. 21. we read "Dominus deus cum ipſo eſt, et clamor regis in ipſo." This Onkelos explains thus: "*Logos* domini dei erit in auxilio ipſorum et *ſchechina regis* illorum inter illos." But Jonathan renders it thus: "*Logos* domini dei eſt illis auxilio et clamor regis *Meſſiæ* vociferatur." Here ſchechina, i. e. *præſentia Dei regis*, is changed for *Meſſiæ regis*, as if they were ſynonimous. At Deut. xxiii. 14. Onkelos has, "Ut non avertatur *logos ejus* benefaciens tibi." But Jonathan explains this "Ne aſcendat *ſchechina ejus* a vobis." Here ſchechina, which was before made ſynonimous with *Meſſias*, is now made ſynonimous with *logos*, as logos had been before with *gloria*. At Deut. xxxi. 3. we read, "Dominus deus tuus tranſibit ante te." This Jonathan explains "Dominus deus tuus et *ſchechina ejus* tranſibit coram vobis." But at v. 8, where the ſame words occur again, he explains them thus: "Et logos domini ſchechina ejus comitatur te." Here *dominus deus*, *ſchechina* and *logos domini*, are all made ſynonimous; or elſe we muſt confeſs, that the Jews uſed their words in ſuch a looſe and vague manner, that no clear and preciſe meaning can be affixed to them:* But, at leaſt, it is evident that St.

* Maimonides himſelf, one of the moſt learned of the Jews, ſays, "The notions of the Jews ſeem very much puzzled, ſo that we cannot find any one who hath ſpoken of religious opinions with any tolerable perſpicuity, but there appears to be ſomething intricate and confuſed in all their diſcourſes." *Preface to his Commentary on* 10*th ch. of the Sanhedrim.*

Paul, who was well acquainted with the Chaldee modes of expreſſion, had no occaſſion to go to the Book of Wiſdom, or to Philo, for the phraſe of calling either the *Meſſiah* or *logos* απαυγασμα θεου, i. e. *the brightneſs of God*; when he could juſt as well have derived that *idea* from the Chaldee paraphraſes and Jewiſh theology current in his own age; and probably the *word* αυγασμα might likewiſe be as common among them in *their* Greek as δοξα, or as *ſchechina*, in their own popular Chaldee dialect.

As to απαυγασμα, if its meaning differed in any reſpect from αυγη and αυγασμα, it ſeems to have been by its including the idea of a *reflected light*, and thereby it would come, in courſe, to expreſs a *luminous image*, like the reflection *from* a looking glaſs. One of the antient lexicons renders απαυγασμα expreſsly by *relucentia*, and that the idea of a *reflected image* was included under it, appears probable from the manner in which it is employed by Philo: for he makes uſe of the word in three places; but in two of them it is employed to expreſs the ſame ſenſe as where it is uſed in the Book of Wiſdom, namely, only to point out, that the *ſoul* or *intellect* of man, is an απαυγασμα from that of God. Now all the other explanatory words employed by him along with it, in both thoſe places, expreſs an *image*, viz. μιμημα, απεικονισμα εκμαγειον, τυπος, χαρακτηρ, εικων, and even αποσπασμα; one may preſume then that απαυγασμα, included the idea of a *luminous image* likewiſe, not merely that of an unreſembling *ſplendor*: more eſpecially, ſince in one of thoſe ſentences

Philo

Philo adds, " that Moſes calls it εικων, becauſe the intellectual nature of God was the *archetype*, that of man the *effigies*;" thus expreſsly including the idea of an *image*. In the 3d paſſage likewiſe, Philo again expreſſes by απαυγασμα, the idea of an *image*; for he ſays, " that the holy ſanctuary in the temple was an απαυγασμα of the holy heavens, an *image* of the original archetype."* Here therefore likewiſe, the word muſt expreſs a *luminous reſemblance*. In a fourth paſſage, Philo reciprocally calls God *the original ſplendor, or glory*, Αυγη;† therefore any *derivative ſplendor* would be probably expreſſed by απαυγασμα, i. e. *a luminous image, or reflection*; this latter ſplendor being the converſe of the former.

I apprehend, moreover, that another Greek word employed by St. Paul, was in like manner derived immediately from Jewiſh theology, that is, μεγαλωσυνη, and was often employed by the Jews, to expreſs in Greek the ſame ſenſe as *ſchechina*, δοξα and απαυγασμα, i. e. *majeſtas divinæ præſentiæ, gloria Dei*: for St. Paul ſays, that " Chriſt ſits at the right hand of the *Majeſty* in the heavens [της μεγαλωσυνης εν ὑψηλοις] Hebr. 1. But when Clemens Romanus quotes from St. Paul the words ὃς ων απαυγασμα της

* Το δε ἁγιασμα, οἱον ἁγιων απαυγασμα, μιμημα αρχετυπου. *De Plant. Noë.*—Vid. *De Opific. Mundi*; and *Quod deter. infid. potior.*

† Θεος αρχετυπος αυγη. *De Cherub*; and *Lib. de Spec. Leg.*

δοξης αυτου, he changes them to ὃς ων απαυγασμα της μεγαλωσυνης αυτου, as if he ſtill expreſſed the ſame ſenſe. Why then might not St. Paul juſt as eaſily interpret *chabud*, or *ſchechina*, by απαυγασμα, in one place, as by μεγαλωσυνη and δοξα in other places, without having any knowledge of Philo, or any view of imitating him? More eſpecially, ſince the word απαυγασμα had appeared likewiſe before in the Book of Wiſdom, although not indeed, applied to the Meſſiah, neither is it any where applied to the Meſſiah by Philo; but the above Jewiſh phraſes, rightly tranſlated by απαυγασμα, are certainly ſometimes applied to the Meſſiah in the Chaldee paraphraſes, as I have ſhewn. It muſt have been theſe therefore, that St. Paul imitated, not Philo.

Vol. iii. p. 75, lin. ult. [*The only improbability in the account of Herodotus is, by his making too ſhort an interval between the birth of Alcæus and the acceſſion of Belus.*]

M. Freret was, I believe, the firſt, who pointed out that Herodotus, Thucydides, and others of that *middle* age, placed the capture of Troy a century earlier, than Eratoſthenes and other authors, in the *later* age of Alexander; and hereby he has vindicated Herodotus from ſome other errors which had been imputed to him: but he has not ſet in a proper light the conſequences which follow from that earlier date of the capture of Troy, by the aſſiſtance it affords towards fixing the time, when the Aſſyrian kingdom *began* and *ended*, according to the opinion

opinion and computations of Herodotus.* This hiſtorian does indeed inform us expreſsly concerning the *duration* of that kingdom, but not concerning the time of its *commencement* and *end* with reſpect to the Olympiads, or any other known event in Greek Chronology. However, ſome facts, which he has given us, enable us to collect the dates of thoſe events out of the circumſtances of his information, as I have ſhewn in my preceding ſtatement, and in my ſubjoined table. Freret, indeed, himſelf collects from the account, which Herodotus has given concerning the kingdom of Lydia, that the reaſon appears, why Homer has never mentioned it, namely, becauſe its origin was later than the war at Troy: but he might have equally well obſerved, that the ſame is the reaſon, why Homer has not mentioned the Aſſyrian kingdom; for it appears by Herodotus, that Ninus muſt have begun *after* the Trojan war according to his own computation of it, and according to that of Eratoſthenes 100 years ſtill *later*. For as Herodotus made Ninus the great grand-ſon of Hercules, if he placed Hercules and the Trojan war 100 years too *ſoon*, he muſt have *neceſſarily* placed Ninus 100 years *too ſoon* likewiſe; the exiſtence of the latter being dependent on the exiſtence of the former.

But beſide thus concluding from the account of Herodotus, that the kingdom under Ninus

* Eſſai ſur la Chronologie des Aſſyriens. Memoir. de l'Academ. tom. vii. 1722.

*began*

*began* later than the Trojan war, as fixed by himſelf, we are enabled alſo to determine when it *ended*, viz. not more than 30 or 40 years before the 1ſt Olympiad; whereas the prophane authors, who have followed the Aſiatic account, given by Cteſias and Beroſus, have placed its end at about 100 years more or leſs.* To this they were probably miſled by their following too cloſely the *aſtrologic* period of 1460, which ended in the 120th year before Nabonaſſar, the 91ſt before Olympiads.† But Herodotus having no ſuch guide to miſlead him from *hiſtoric* truth, either himſelf computed the times of theſe events by generations, or elſe copied them from other Greek hiſtorians who had preceded him, Acuſilaus, Hecatæus, Hellanicus, or ſome others, who have all periſhed: he has hereby been of the greateſt ſervice to modern Chronology, and conſequently to that of the Jewiſh ſcriptures, by his having thus preſerved from oblivion the only *prophane* teſtimony now extant concerning the date of the *end* of the Aſſyrian kingdom, according to the computations of the antients, when founded on *hiſtoric* evidence only; without being corrupted by the accounts of thoſe *later* Greek writers, who have too readily adopted the *aſtrologic* chronology of Beroſus and other Aſiatic information. This *hiſtoric* evidence and date by Herodotus is the more important, as it coincides with, and juſtifies the date of the ſame event, as given by the Chriſtian

* See p. 45. vol. iii.
† See Append. vol. iii. p. 54.

Chronologers,

Chronologers, Euſebius, Syncellus, and Jerome: who have unfortunately not informed us on what foundation they have thus differed from other earlier writers, both prophane and Chriſtian, in their aſſigning only 30 or 40 years between the *end* of the Aſſyrian kingdom and the Olympiads; where thoſe others had aſſigned 100 years, more or leſs, and among theſe apparently even Africanus likewiſe.* It may be acceptable then, if I ſet in a ſtill clearer light this important conſequence, which thus reſults from the information and computations of Herodotus, as already ſtated in my table, in juſtification of the above Chriſtian Chronologers; more eſpecially, as it is a ſubject which I have not ſeen noticed by any modern authors, who have all, even Pezron and Freret alſo, too readily admitted the aſtrologic *end* of the Aſſyrian kingdom, even when not its *commencement*; nay, Uſher himſelf, though the only one who has rightly followed Herodotus concerning the *duration* of it, has nevertheleſs deſerted his account both with reſpect to the time of its *beginning* and *end*; for he has placed its beginning under Ninus 83 years *before* the Trojan war, and its *end* 28 years *after* the firſt Olympiad. This has been the conſequence of his incoherently mixing

* Syncellus makes the interval between the end of the Aſſyrian kingdom and the 1ſt Olympiad to amount to 50 years; but then he has placed the 1ſt Olympiad 10 years too late in the Julian calendar, reſpect being had to his date of the death of Alexander at the end of 113th Olympiad; ſo that his real interval is only 40 years, as in Euſebius.

together the accounts of different antient ſyſtems, inſtead of ſearching out which ſyſtem was the beſt and adhering chiefly to that: thus he takes the *duration* from Herodotus, the *end* from Paterculus, and the *beginning* neither from Herodotus nor yet Cteſias, nor conſiſtently with any antient author whatever. If the preſent text of Paterculus could be depended on by him for bringing down the *end* of the Aſſyrian kingdom *ſo late* as Nabonaſſar, why not alſo credited by him for its *duration*, which it ſtates at 1070 years inſtead of 520?

Beſide the advantage in following more cloſely the hiſtoric ſyſtem of Herodotus, becauſe it makes him conſiſtent with himſelf, and likewiſe with the *end* of the Aſſyrian kingdom as ſtated by Euſebius, Syncellus, and Jerome, (which they probably had copied from ſome prophane hiſtory now periſhed) we ſhall moreover find, that it hereby becomes conſiſtent with the Jewiſh ſcriptures, and ſtill farther with the account of Cteſias concerning the Median kings of Aſſyria, who ſucceeded Arbaces; for hereby Arbaces and his next five ſucceſſors become *cotemporary* with the ſix Aſſyrian kings mentioned in ſcripture, Jarib, Pul, Tiglah, Salmanaſſar, Sennacherib, and Eſarchaddon. If theſe two ſets of kings were thus cotemporary and both of them ſaid to have reigned at the ſame place, Niniveh in Aſſyria, how can we conceive, but that they were identically the ſame ſix kings, although ſcarcely any of their names agree? Cteſias derived his accounts from the Perſians, and accordingly has plainly given them the names,

names, by which they were known to the Perſians, as appears by the word *Arta* prefixed to ſeveral of them, as Arti-cas, Arti-barnas, &c.: this Herodotus tells us meant *great*, and it was a prefix commonly in uſe with the Perſians, as in Artaxerxes. The Jews and Syrians on the weſt of Aſſyria could ſcarcely be expected to know theſe kings by the ſame names as the Perſians ſo far to the eaſtward of that country: the ſixth of them *Arta-eus* reigned however the very ſame number of years (40) as the other ſixth king Ezarchaddin (vide my table, vol. 2. p. 217) and was probably the ſame perſon; the firſt of them *Arbaces* much reſembles *Jarib* in name, who is twice mentioned by Hoſea.* Hoſea prophecied under Jereboam II, and they were both cotemporary with Arbaces; for Jereboam began to reign about 50 years before the 1ſt Olympiad. As Arbaces reigned between 20 and 30 years, Pul his ſucceſſor, the firſt Aſſyrian king who went againſt Syria and Mena-

* Reland ſhews that *ces* at the end of the names of Perſian kings as in *Xerxes*, *Dejoces*, &c. is only a corruption by the Greeks of *Shah*, ſo that *Arba-ces* is *Arba-Shah*, *King-Jarb*. The Commentators differ whether *Jarib* in Hoſea be the name of a perſon or place, although the word *king* is joined to it. Jerom and others conceive that it is an epithet in the ſenſe of *Ultor*, but they cannot agree to what Aſſyrian king it is to be applied in this ſenſe or why. If there be any truth in its meaning *Ultor*, we eaſily ſee with what propriety it would be applied to Arbaces; which might have been done not merely by the Jews, but by all other nations. Some antient hiſtories now periſhed, may have recorded this origin to the name of Arbaces; and it is not impoſſible that Horace may allude to this, when he ſtyles Auguſtus *Cæſaris ultor*. *Reland, Diſſ. Miſcell. p.* 259.

hem king of Iſrael, would be ſtill on the throne at about 10 years after the 1ſt Olympiad when Menahem reigned. Jonas alſo prophecied againſt Ninevah under Jereboam, at which time the kingdom of Aſſyria at Ninevah was not diſſolved, therefore he muſt have prophecied in the very beginning of Jereboam's reign; ſo that the Aſſyrian kingdom could not have *ended* according to the ſcriptures, until about 40 years at earlieſt before the Olympiads, juſt as ſtated by Herodotus. Readers will hereby ſee, that our minute enquiry concerning the Aſſyrian kingdom is not uſeleſs, but tends to ſhew, that harmony ſubſiſted between the Jewiſh ſcriptures and prophane hiſtory, before the latter was corrupted by thoſe aſtrologic computations of Aſiatic nations, imported into Greece *after* the age of Herodotus, firſt by Cteſias and almoſt a century later confirmed by Beroſus the Aſiatic hiſtorian, who were too much credited by the Greek chronologers *afterwards*.

Let us then vindicate his computations in a ſtill more particular manner from the *improbability* above referred to, the only one which occurs in my foregoing ſtatement of them, and which is in reality only an apparent one, ariſing from my ſtatement being purpoſely arranged, ſo as to ſhew in the ſtrongeſt light the ill conſequence and improbability which would neceſſarily follow from our placing the *end* of the Aſſyrian kingdom at an *earlier* date than 40 years before the Olympiads, 70 before Nabonaſſar. My ſtatement is at p. 71, v. 3. founded on this very ſuppoſition, and we ſee, that the ill

conſequence

conſequence which even at that *late* date follows from it is, that the interval between the birth of Alcæus and the acceſſion of Belus is *too ſhort*, ſo that it is only barely *poſſible* for the latter to be born, when Alcæus was only 14, and to have aſcended the throne of Aſſyria at 13. I have mentioned alſo, that an augmentation of that interval to 10 years more would remove the improbability, and I have now to ſhew, that accordingly, two or three ſmall variations may conſiſtently be made in my ſtatement, which will produce the augmentation required; ſo that Alcæus might have been 18 at the birth of Belus, and the latter 19, when he aſcended the throne, or more.

The *firſt* of theſe I have already pointed out at p. 120, which is, from the teſtimony of Jerom, that ſome *prophane* ſyſtems of chronology ſeem to have placed the *end* of the Aſſyrian kingdom at not more than 30 years before the Olympiads: but we cannot be altogether certain as to what latitude we ought there to allow to his expreſſions. His date is however confirmed by Iſidorus, who places the event under Uzzias.*

A *ſecond* variation moreover, may be made at the *beginning* of the Aſſyrian period; for Herodotus reckons the 800 years before his own birth only from the birth of Pan, which he ſays was a *little later* than the capture of Troy;

* Uzzias did not accede until the 27th of Jereboam. 2 *K.* 15. Iſidorus ſays, "Ozias ann. 52. Olimpias inſtituitur; Aſſyriorum que regnum in Medos transfertur." *Origin. Lib.* 5. *c.* 42.

how much later is uncertain, but I have hitherto made no allowance for this difference. Freret allows 10 years, concerning which we are quite ignorant; but if we thus raiſe up the capture of Troy 10 years, we raiſe alſo the Argonautic expedition 10 years, and conſequently augment the interval between Alcæus and Belus by 10 years likewiſe; the acceſſion of Belus being fixed by the 520 years before the 40th year preceding the 1ſt Olympiad, but the birth of Alcæus by the date of the Argonautic expedition.

*Thirdly*, although the Argonautic expedition is generally placed at 80 years before the capture of Troy, yet Herodotus, and the Chronologers of his age might place it 10 years earlier, which again would produce the ſame effect. Euſebius, from ſome prophane authors, fixes it at 100 years before Troy; Clemens makes it more. Newton indeed contends, that the interval ought to be much leſs; but our enquiry is only concerning what the computations of that age were, not what they ought to have been; Calmet makes it 89 years.

If then any one of theſe variations, or all of them together cauſe an augmentation of the interval to the amount only of 10 years, every difficulty and objection will be thus removed from my ſtatement, and the whole of the computations of Herodotus will be in harmony both with reſpect to Aſſyria and Lydia, and alſo reſpecting the capture of Troy; and ſuch harmony in regard to the dates and antiquities of three ſuch unconnected computations, concerning three different and diſtant nations,

is certainly an indication of truth; more eſpecially ſince they at the ſame coincide at their *end* with the Jewiſh ſcriptures and in *other* articles with the accounts of Cteſias. If with reſpect to the *commencement* of them Herodotus and his predeceſſors have carried back events to *too early* dates, yet, in caſe the ſame error pervades them all alike, their *relative* diſtances from each other may ſtill be nearly right, more eſpecially with reſpect to the *end* of the Aſſyrian kingdom, which was an event more likely to be well known and recorded than its *beginning*, this being generally obſcure and uncertain in all nations: and his agreement in this article with the *time* of Jarib in Hoſea, with the prophecy of Jonas under Jereboam, and with the dates of Euſebius, Syncellus and Jerom, is certainly a ſtrong confirmation of his computations; for harmony between *unconnected* accounts is a better teſtimony to truth, than the ſyſtems of any chronologers. With reſpect to Hoſea, it may be further obſerved, that while the firſt race of Aſſyrian kings were enervated by luxury and indolence, it could not be expected that they ſhould interfere in the wars of Syria; but when a more active race under Arbaces aſcended the throne, the king of Iſrael, Jereboam, ſeems to have applied to Arbaces [Jarib] for aſſiſtance againſt the kings of Syria, by whom the Iſraelites were then diſtreſſed, as mentioned 2 K. 13. 22: this Hoſea plainly thus teſtifies, "When Ephraim ſaw his ſickneſs, and Judah his wound, then went Ephraim to the Aſſyrian, and ſent to king Jarib, yet could

could he not heal you nor cure you of your wound." 5. 13.; and again at ch. 16. 11. "They go to Aſſyria." The time when this application was made, is clearly pointed out by theſe words, *when Judah ſaw his wound*, to have happened *later* than the victory of Jehoaſh over Amaziah king of Judah, near the *end* of the reign of Jehoaſh, father of Jereboam; therefore the application *might be* after the *commencement* of Jereboam, but before he had defeated the Syrians, as he did afterwards. About this time Arbaces became king of Aſſyria, but it could not have been at the very commencement of Jereboam, becauſe Jonas predicted the fall of Aſſyria under Jereboam, probably at his aſcending the throne, and it happened ſoon after; ſo that Arbaces was cotemporary with this *Jarib* in queſtion, therefore probably the ſame Aſſyrian king, as the names alſo confirm.

If it ſhould be ſtill ſuſpected, that Euſebius purpoſely brought down *thus late* the fall of Aſſyria to the reign of Jereboam, becauſe the Aſſyrian kingdom was plainly not diſſolved when Jonas propheſied at the commencement of Jereboam, thus cutting off 60 years out of 100; yet this could not have been his motive, becauſe he does not place the acceſſion of Arbaces until 20 years after the acceſſion of Jereboam. Againſt Syncellus the ſuſpicion may have more force, becauſe he fixes the firſt of Arbaces within four years after the acceſſion of Jereboam, thus leaving four years only for Jonas to predict the fall of Aſſyria. But it is more probable, that they both followed ſome antient

antient hiſtory now periſhed, ſince I have proved, that Herodotus had long before them placed the fall of Aſſyria as late as Euſebius, and not more than 30 or 40 years before the 1ſt Olympiad, before which dates Jereboam had commenced.

I have erroneouſly ſaid in p. 143 above, "that Uſher was the only author, who had rightly adopted the *duration* of the 520 years in Herodotus," for he has been followed in this by Calmet and the Univerſal Hiſtory; and they have equally and blindly followed him in his errors, both concerning the *beginning* and *end of* the Aſſyrian kingdom; except that Calmet did indeed, in 1735, ſeem to have foreſeen the juſt cenſure on Uſher produced by Vignoles in 1738, becauſe he has attempted to avoid it, but it has been by introducing other errors as great: this is by placing the exploits and death of Hercules ſo early, that he might have been conſiſtently the grandfather of Belus, whoſe acceſſion he fixes at 138 years before Troy, and the firſt attempt of the Heraclidæ to return to Peloponneſus, at 30 years later; which attempt having taken place within 30 years after the death of Hercules, the latter event therefore is fixed about the acceſſion of Belus. But thus Hercules was dead 90 years before Calmet's date of the Argonautic expedition, in which he partook, and 138 years before the capture of Troy, both which are contradicted by all antient hiſtory.* The Univerſal Hiſtory has not at-

* Vid. Brevis Chronolog. a Calmet Venet. 1737. p. 6.

tempted

tempted to palliate or remove the error imputed to Uſher's ſtatement by Vignoles, which had then been publiſhed:* I call it an error, becauſe if Uſher followed Herodotus in the *duration* of the kingdom, why not alſo in the *deſcent* of thoſe kings from Hercules?

But in order to confirm the above harmony, one other remark is ſtill neceſſary. I have ſaid above at p. 144, "that Uſher had not fixed the *beginning* agreeably to any antient author whatever," for apparently he has again in this point departed from the meaning of Herodotus, by conceiving the 520 years to begin with Ninus, inſtead of Belus: there is nothing in the words of that hiſtorian, which can determine with which of the two kings that period commenced; but why then fix on Ninus, which makes the whole inconſiſtent, rather than Belus, which produces harmony? and certainly Belus is always in antient authors mentioned as the founder of the kingdom, although his ſon Ninus enlarged the dominions by his conqueſts.† In this error both Calmet and Univerſal Hiſtory have again followed Uſher; but it has been corrected in my table, and Belus placed at the *beginning* of the 520 years, whereby he commenced only 52 years before Troy, not as in Uſher, Calmet and Univerſal Hiſtory, above a century.

* See my p. 83, of vol. iii.

† Both Cteſias and Beroſus began the period with Belus, why then not Herodotus alſo?